arXiv:alg-geom/9611021v2 10 Mar 1998

Virtual neighborhoods and pseudo-holomorphic curves

Yongbin Ruan[1]

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53706

1 Introduction

Since Gromov introduced his pseudo-holomorphic curve theory in the 80's, pseudo-holomorphic curve has soon become an eminent technique in symplectic topology. Many important theorems in this field have been proved by this technique, among them, the squeezing theorem [Gr], the rigidity theorem [E], the classification of rational and ruled symplectic 4-manifolds [M2], the proof of the existence of non-deformation equivalent symplectic structures [R2]. The pseudo-holomorphic curve also plays a critical role in a number of new subjects such as Floer homology theory,etc.

In the meantime of this development, a great deal of efforts has been made to solidify the foundation of pseudo-holomorphic curve theory, for examples, McDuff's transversality theorem for "cusp curves" [M1] and the various proofs of Gromov compactness theorem. In the early day of Gromov theory, Gromov compactness theorem was enough for its applications to symplectic topology. However, it was insufficient for its potential applications in algebraic geometry, where a good compactification is often very important. For example, it is particularly desirable to tie Gromov-compactness theorem to the Deligne-Mumford compactification of the moduli space of stable curves. Gromov's original proof is geometric. Afterwards, many works were done to prove Gromov compactness theorem in the line of Uhlenbeck bubbling off. It was succeed by Parker-Wolfson [PW] and Ye [Ye]. One outcome of their work was a more delicate compactification of the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic maps. But it didn't attract much attention until several years later when Kontsevich and Manin [KM] rediscovered this new compactification in algebraic geometry and initiated an algebro-geometric approach to the same theory. Now this new compactification becomes known as the moduli space of stable maps. The moduli space of stable maps is one of the basic ingredients of this paper.

During last several years, pseudo-holomorphic curve theory entered a period of rapid expansion. We has witnessed its intensive interactions with algebraic geometry, mathematical physics and re-

---

[1] partially supported by a NSF grant and a Sloan fellowship

cently with new Seiberg-Witten theory of 4-manifolds [T2]. One should mention that those recent activities in pseudo-holomorphic curve theory did not come from the internal drive of symplectic topology. It was influenced mostly by mathematical physics, particularly, Witten's theory of topological sigma model. Around 1990, there were many activities in string theory about "quantum cohomology" and mirror symmetry. The core of quantum cohomology theory is so called "counting the numbers of rational curves". Many incredible predictions were made about those numbers in Calabi-Yau 3-folds, based on results from physics. But mathematicians were frustrated about the meaning of the so-called "number of rational curves". For example, the finiteness of such number is a well-known conjecture due to H. Clemens which concerns simplest Calabi-Yau 3-folds-Quintic hypersurface of $\mathbf{P}^4$. It was even worse that some Calabi-Yau 3-fold never has a finite number of rational curves. One of the basic difficulties at that time was that people usually restricted their attention to Kahler manifolds, where the complex structure is rigid. On the other hand, the advantage of pseudo-holomorphic curves is that we are allowed to choose almost complex structures, which are much more flexible. Unfortunately, the most of those exciting developments were little known to symplectic topologists. In [R1], the author brought the machinery of pseudo-holomorphic curves into quantum cohomology and mirror symmetry. Using ideas from Donaldson theory, the author provided a rigorous definition of the symplectic invariants corresponding the "numbers of rational curves" in string theory. Moreover, the author found many applications of new symplectic invariants in symplectic topology [R1], [R2], [R3]. These new invariants are called "Gromov-Witten invariants".

Gromov-Witten invariants are analogous of invariants in the enumerative geometry. However, the actual counting problem (like the numbers of higher degree rational curves in quintic threefold) did not attract much of attention before the discovery of mirror symmetry. In general, these numbers are difficult to compute. Moreover, computing these number didn't seems to help our understanding of Calabi-Yau 3-folds themself. The introduction of quantum cohomology hence opened a new direction for enumerative geometry. According to quantum cohomology theory, these enumerative invariants are not isolated numbers; instead, they are encoded in a new cohomological structure of underline manifold. Note that the quantum cohomology structure is governed by the associativity law, which corresponds to the famous composition law of topological quantum field theory. Therefore, it would be very important to put quantum cohomology in a rigorous mathematical foundation. It was clear that the enumerative geometry is not a correct framework. (For example, the associativity or composition law of quantum cohomology computes certain higher genus invariants, which are always different from enumerative invariants). Based on [R1], a correct mathematical framework were layed down by the author and Tian [RT1], [RT2] in terms of perturbed holomorphic maps. By proving the crucial associativity law, we put quantum cohomology in a solid mathematical ground. A corollary of the proof of associativity law is a computation of the number of rational curves in $\mathbf{P}^n$ and many Fano manifolds by recursion formulas. Such a formula for $\mathbf{P}^2$ was first derived by Kontsevich, based on associativity law predicted by physicists. It should be pointed out that the entire pseudo-holomorphic curve theory were only established for so-called semi-positive symplectic manifolds. They includes most of interesting examples like Fano and Calabi-Yau manifolds. But, semipositivity is a significant obstacle for some of its important applications like Arnold conjecture and birational geometry.

Stimulated by the success of symplectic method, the progreses have been made on algebro-geometrical approach. An important step is Kontsevich-Manin's initiative of using stable (holomorphic) maps. The genus 0 stable map works nicely for homogeneous space. For example, the moduli spaces of genus 0 stable maps always have expected dimension. Many of results in [R1], [RT1] were redone in this category by [KM], [LT1]. It was soon realized that moduli spaces of stable maps no longer have expected dimension for non-homogeneous spaces, for example, projective bundles [QR]. To go beyond homogeneous spaces, one needs new ideas. A breakthrough came with the work of Li and Tian [LT2], where they employ a sophisticated excessive intersection theory (normal cone construction) (see another proof in [B]). As a consequence, Li and Tian extended GW-invariant to arbitrary algebraic manifolds. In the light of these new developments, three obvious problems have emerged: (i) to remove semi-positivity condition in Gromov-Witten invariants; (ii) to remove semi-positive condition in Floer homology and solve Arnold conjecture. (iii) to prove that symplectic GW-invariants are the same as algebro-geometric GW-invariants for algebraic manifolds. We will deal with first two problems in this article and leave the last one to the future research.

Recall that, the fundamental difficulty for pseudo-holomorphic curve theory on non-semi-positive symplectic manifolds is, that $\overline{\mathcal{M}} - \mathcal{M}$ may have arger dimension than that of $\mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic maps and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is a compactification. One view is that this is due to the reason that the almost complex structure is not generic at infinity. To deal with this non-generic situation, the author's idea [R3] (Proposition 5.7) was to construct an open smooth manifold (virtual neighborhood) to contain the moduli space. Then, we can work on virtual neighborhood, which is much easier to handle than the moduli space itself. In [R4], the author outlined a scheme to attack the non-generic problems in Donaldson-type theory using virtual neighborhood technique. Moreover, author applied virtual neighborhood technique to monopole equation under a group action. Further application can be found in [RW]. But the case in [R4] is too restricted for pseudo-holomorphic case. Recall that in [R4], we work with a compact-smooth triple $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{F}, S)$ where $\mathcal{B}$ is a smooth Banach manifold (configuration space), $\mathcal{F}$ is a smooth Banach bundle and S is a section of $\mathcal{F}$ such that the moduli space $\mathcal{M} = S^{-1}(0)$ is compact. Monopole equation can be interpreted as a smooth-compact triple. However, in the case of pseudo-holomorphic curve, $S^{-1}(0)$ is almost never compact in the configuration space. Furthermore, $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{F})$ is often not smooth, but a pair of V-manifold and V-bundle. To overcome these difficulty, we need to generalize the virtual neighborhood technique to handle this situation. An outline of such a generalization were given in [R4].

Another purpose of this paper is to construct an equivariant quantum cohomology theory. For this purpose, we need to study the GW-invariant for a family of symplectic manifolds. We shall work in this generality throughout the paper. Let's outline a definition of GW-invariant over a family of symplectic manifolds as follows.

Let $P : Y \to X$ be a fiber bundle such that both the fiber V and the base X are smooth compact, oriented manifolds. Furthermore, we assume that $P : Y \to X$ is an oriented fibration. Then, Y is also a smooth, compact, oriented manifold. Let ω be a closed 2-form on Y such that ω restricts to a symplectic form over each fiber. A ω-tamed almost complex structure J is an automorphism of vertical tangent bundle such that $J^2 = -Id$ and $\omega(X, JX) > 0$ for vertical tangent vector $X \neq 0$. Let $A \in H_2(V, \mathbf{Z}) \subset H_2(Y, \mathbf{Z})$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{g,k}$ be the moduli space of genus g Riemann surfaces with k-marked points such that $2g + k > 2$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ be its Deligne-Mumford compactification. Suppose that $f : \Sigma \to Y$ ($\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{g,k}$) is a smooth map such that $im(f)$ is contained in a fiber and f satisfies Cauchy Riemann equation $\partial_J f = 0$ with $[f] = A$. Let $\mathcal{M}_A(Y, g, k, J)$ be the moduli space of such f. First we need a stable compactification of $\mathcal{M}_A(Y, g, k, J)$. Roughly speaking, *a compactification is stable if its local Kuranish model is the quotient of vector spaces by a finite group.* In our case, it is provided by the moduli space of stable holomorphic maps $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$.

There are two technical difficulties to use virtual neighborhood technique to the case of pseudo-holomorphic curve. The first one is that there is a finite group action on its local Kuranish model. An indication is that we should work in the V-manifold and V-bundle category. As a matter of fact, it is easy to extend virtual neighborhood technique to this category. However, the finite dimensional virtual neighborhood constructed is a V-manifold in this case. It is well-known that the ordinary transversality theorem fails for V-manifolds. We will overcome this problem by using differential form and integration. We shall give a detail argument in section 2. The second problem is the failure of the compactness of $\mathcal{M}_A(Y,g,k)$. To include $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y,g,k)$, we have to enlarge our configuration space to $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$ of C^∞-stable (holomorphic or not) maps. Then, the obstruction bundle $\mathcal{F}_A(Y,g,k)$ extends to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y,g,k)$ over $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$. Therefore, we obtained a compact triple $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k), \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y,g,k), \mathcal{S})$, where S is Cauchy-Riemann equation. We want to generalize the virtual neighborhood technique to this enlarge space. Recall that for virtual neighborhood technique, we construct some stablizations of the equation $\mathcal{S}_e = \mathcal{S}+s$, which must satisfy two crucial properties: (1) $\{x; Coker\delta_x(\mathcal{S}+s)=0\}$ is open; (2)If $\mathcal{S}+s$ is a transverse section, $U=(\mathcal{S}+s)^{-1}(0)$ is a finite dimensional smooth V-manifold. By using gluing argument, we can construct a local model of U (local Kuranish model). (2) is equivalent to that the local Kuranish model is a quotient of vector spaces by a finite group. By definition, it means that our compactification has to be stable. Finally, we need an additional argument to prove that the local models patch together smoothly. We call a triple satisfying (1), (2) *virtual neighborhood technique admissible* or *VNA*.

Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ is already transverse. $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(Y,g,k)$ is naturally a stratified space whose stratification coincides with that of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$. The attaching map of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$ is defined by patching construction. The gluing theorem shows that if we restrict ourself to stable holomorphic maps one can deform this attaching map slightly such that the image of stable holomorphic maps is again holomorphic. The deformed attaching map gives a local smooth coordinate of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y,g,k)$. Although it is not necessary in virtual neighborhood construction, one can also attempt to deform the whole attaching map by the same implicit funtion theorem argument. Then, it is attempting to think (as author did) that the deformed attaching map will give a smooth coordinate of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$. It was Tian who pointed out the author that this is false. However, it is natural to ask if there is any general property for such an infinite dimensional object. Indeed, some elegant properties are formulated by Li and Tian [LT3] and we refer reader to their paper for the detail.

Applying virtual neighborhood technique, we construct a finite dimensional virtual neighborhood (U,F,S). More precisely, U is covered by finite many coordinate charts of the form U_i/G_i $(i=1,\dots,m)$ for $U_p \subset \mathbf{R}^{ind+m}$ and a finite group G_p. F is a V-bundle over U and $S: U\rightarrow F$ is a section. On the other hand, the evaluation maps over marked points define a map

$$\Xi_{g,k}: \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)\rightarrow Y^k. \tag{1.1}$$

We have another map

$$\chi : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}. \tag{1.2}$$

Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ is a V-manifold. To define GW-invariant, choose a Thom form Θ supported in a neighborhood of zero section. The GW-invariant can be defined as

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) = \int_U \chi^*(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k} \prod_i \alpha_i \wedge S^*\Theta. \tag{1.4}$$

for $\alpha_i \in H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$ and $K \in H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}, \mathbf{R})$ represented by differential form. Clearly, $\Psi^Y = 0$ if $\sum deg(\alpha_i) + deg(K) \neq ind.$

Recall that $H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$ has a modular structure by $P^*\alpha$ for $\alpha \in H^*(X, \mathbf{R})$. In this paper, we prove the following,

Theorem A (Theorem 4.2): *(i).*$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)$ *is well-defined.*

(ii). $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)$ *is independent of the choice of virtual neighborhoods.*

(iii). $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)$ *is independent of* J *and is a symplectic deformation invariant.*

(iv). When $Y = V$ *is semi-positive,* $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)$ *agrees with the definition of [RT2].*

(v). $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_i \cup P^*\alpha, \cdots, \alpha_k) = \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_j \cup P^*\alpha, \cdots, \alpha_k)$

Furthermore, we can show that Ψ satisfies the composition law required by the theory of sigma model coupled with gravity. Assume $g = g_1 + g_2$ and $k = k_1 + k_2$ with $2g_i + k_i \geq 3$. Fix a decomposition $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ of $\{1, \cdots, k\}$ with $|S_i| = k_i$. Then there is a canonical embedding $\theta_S : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,k_2+1} \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$, which assigns to marked curves $(\Sigma_i; x^i_1, \cdots, x^i_{k_1+1})$ $(i = 1, 2)$, their union $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ with $x^1_{k_1+1}$ identified to $x^2_{k_2+1}$ and remaining points renumbered by $\{1, \cdots, k\}$ according to S.

There is another natural map $\mu : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,k+2} \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ by gluing together the last two marked points.

Choose a homogeneous basis $\{\beta_b\}_{1 \leq b \leq L}$ of $H_*(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ modulo torsion. Let (η_{ab}) be its intersection matrix. Note that $\eta_{ab} = \beta_a \cdot \beta_b = 0$ if the dimensions of β_a and β_b are not complementary to each other. Put (η^{ab}) to be the inverse of (η_{ab}). Now we can state the composition law, which consists of two formulas as follows.

Theorem B. (Theorem 4.7) *Let* $[K_i] \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_i,k_i+1}, \mathbf{Q})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ *and* $[K_0] \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,k+2}, \mathbf{Q})$. *For any* $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k$ *in* $H_*(V, \mathbf{Z})$*. Then we have*

(1.5)

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\theta_{S*}[K_1\times K_2];\{\alpha_i\})\\ = (-1)^{deg(K_2)\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} deg(\alpha_i)} &\sum_{A=A_1+A_2}\sum_{a,b}\Psi^Y_{(A_1,g_1,k_1+1)}([K_1];\{\alpha_i\}_{i\le k_1},\beta_a)\eta^{ab}\Psi^Y_{(A_2,g_2,k_2+1)}([K_2];\beta_b,\{\alpha_j\}_{j>k_1})\end{aligned}$$

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\mu_*[K_0];\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)=\sum_{a,b}\Psi^Y_{(A,g-1,k+2)}([K_0];\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k,\beta_a,\beta_b)\eta^{ab} \tag{1.6}$$

There is a natural map $\pi:\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k-1}$ as follows: For $(\Sigma,x_1,\cdots,x_k)\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$, if x_k is not in any rational component of Σ which contains only three special points, then we define

$$\pi(\Sigma,x_1,\cdots,x_k)=(\Sigma,x_1,\cdots,x_{k-1}),$$

where a distinguished point of Σ is either a singular point or a marked point. If x_k is in one of such rational components, we contract this component and obtain a stable curve $(\Sigma',x_1,\cdots,x_{k-1})$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k-1}$, and define $\pi(\Sigma,x_1,\cdots,x_k)=(\Sigma',x_1,\cdots,x_{k-1})$.

Clearly, π is continuous. One should be aware that there are two exceptional cases $(g,k)=(0,3),(1,1)$ where π is not well defined. Associated with π, we have two *k-reduction formula* for $\Psi^V_{(A,g,k)}$ as following:

Proposition C (Proposition 4.4). *Suppose that $(g,k)\neq(0,3),(1,1)$.*

(1) For any $\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1}$ in $H_*(Y,\mathbf{Z})$, we have

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1},[V]) \;=\; \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k-1)}([\pi_*(K)];\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1}) \tag{1.7}$$

(2) Let α_k be in $H_{2n-2}(Y,\mathbf{Z})$, then

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\pi^*(K);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k) \;=\; \alpha_k^*(A)\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k-1)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1}) \tag{1.8}$$

where α_k^* is the Poincare dual of α_k.

When $Y=V$, Ψ^Y is the ordinary GW-invariants. Therefore, we establish a theory of topological sigma model couple with gravity over any symplectic manifolds.

It is well-known that GW-invariant can be used to define a quantum multiplication. Let's briefly sketch it as follows. First we define a total 3-point function

$$\Psi^V_\omega(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)=\sum_A\Psi^V_{(A,0,3)}(pt;\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)q^A, \tag{1.9}$$

where q^A is an element of Novikov ring Λ_ω (see [RT1], [MS]). Then, we define a quantum multiplication $\alpha \times_Q \beta$ over $H^*(V, \Lambda_\omega)$ by the relation

$$(\alpha \times_Q \beta) \cup \gamma[V] = \Psi^V_\omega(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3), \tag{1.10}$$

where $\cup$ represents the ordinary cup product. As a consequence of Theorem B, we have

Proposition D: *Quantum multiplication is associative over any symplectic manifolds. Hence, there is a quantum ring structure over any symplectic manifolds.*

Given a periodic Hamiltonian function $H : S^1 \times V \to V$, we can define the Floer homology $HF(V, H)$, whose chain complex is generated by the periodic orbits of H and the boundary maps are defined by the moduli spaces of flow lines. So far, Floer homology $HF(V, H)$ is only defined for semi-positive symplectic manifolds. Applying virtual neighborhood technique to Floer homology, we show

Theorem E: *Floer homology $HF(V, H)$ is well-defined for any symplectic manifolds. Furthermore, $HF(V, H)$ is independent of H.*

Recall that Floer homology was invented to solve the

Arnold conjecture: Let ϕ be a non-degenerate Hamiltonian symplectomorphism. Then, the number of the fixed points of ϕ is greater than or equal to the sum of Betti number of V.

As a corollary of Theorem E, we prove the Arnold conjecture

Theorem F: *Arnold conjecture holds for any symplectic manifolds.*

In this paper, we give another application of our results in higher dimensional algebraic geometry. It was discovered in [R3] that symplectic geometry has a strong connection with Mori's birational geometry. An important notion in birational geometry is uniruled variety, generalizing the notion of ruled surfaces in two dimension. An algebraic variety V is uniruled iff V is covered by rational curves. Kollar [K1] proved that for 3-folds, uniruledness is a symplectic property. Namely, if a 3-fold W is symplectic deformation equivalent to an uniruled variety V, W is uniruled. To extend Kollar's result, we need a symplectic GW-invariants defined over any symplectic manifolds with certain property (Lemma 4.10). We will show that our invariant satisfies this properties. By combining with Kollar's result, we have

Proposition G: *If a smooth Kahler manifold W is symplectic deformation equivalent to a uniruled* *variety, W is uniruled.*

An important topic in quantum cohomology theory is the equivariant quantum cohomology group $QH_G(V)$, which generalizes the notion of equivariant cohomology. Suppose that a compact Lie group G acts on V as symplectomorphisms. To define equivariant quantum cohomology, we first have to define equivariant GW-invariants. There are two approaches. The first approach is to choose a G-invariant tamed almost complex structure J and construct an equivariant virtual neighborhood. Then, we can use finite dimensional equivariant technique to define equivariant GW-invariant. This approach indeed works. But a technically simpler approach is to consider equivariant GW-invariant as the limit of GW-invariant over the families of symplectic manifolds. This approach was advocated by Givental and Kim [GK]. We shall use this approach here.

Let BG be the classifying space of G and $EG \to BG$ be the universal G-bundle. Suppose that

$$BG_1 \subset BG_2 \cdots \subset BG_m \subset BG \tag{1.11}$$

such that BG_i is a smooth oriented compact manifold and $BG = \cup_i BG_i$. Let

$$EG_1 \subset EG_2 \cdots \subset EG_m \subset BG \tag{1.12}$$

be the corresponding universal bundle. We can also form the approximation of homotopy quotient $V_G = V \times EG/G$ by $V^i_G = V \times EG_i/G$. Since ω is invariant under G, its pull-back on $V \times EG_i$ descends to V^i_G. So, we have a family of symplectic manifolds $P_i : V^i \to BG_i$. Applying our previous construction, we obtain GW-invariant $\Psi^{P_i}_{(A,g,k)}$. We define equivariant GW-invariant

$$\Psi^G_{(A,g,k)} \in Hom((H^*(V_G, \mathbf{Z}))^{\otimes k} \otimes H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}, \mathbf{Z}), H^*(BG, \mathbf{Z})) \tag{1.13}$$

as follow:

For any $D \in H_*(BG, \mathbf{Z})$, $D \in H_*(BG_i, \mathbf{Z})$ for some i. Let $i_{V^i_G} : V^i_G \to V_G$. For $\alpha_i \in H^*_G(V)$, we define

$$\Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}(K, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)(D) = \Psi^{P_i}_{(A,g,k)}(K, i^*_{V^i_G}(\alpha_1), \cdots, i^*_{V^i_G}(\alpha_k); P^*_i(D^*_{BG_i})), \tag{1.14}$$

where $D^*_{BG_i}$ is the Poincare dual of D with respect to BG_i.

Theorem G: *(i). $\Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}$ is independent of the choice of BG_i.*

(ii). If ω_t is a family of G-invariant symplectic forms, $\Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}$ is independent of ω_t.

Recall that equivariant cohomology ring $H^*_G(X)$ is defined as $H^*(V_G)$. Notes that, for any equivariant cohomology class $\alpha \in H^*_G(V)$,

$$\alpha[V] \in H^*(BG) \tag{1.15}$$

instead of being a number in the case of the ordinary cohomology ring. Furthermore, there is a modulo structure by $H^*_G(pt) = H^*(BG)$, defined by using the projection map

$$V_G \to BG. \tag{1.16}$$

The equivariant quantum multiplication is a new multiplication structure over $H^*_G(V, \Lambda_\omega) = H^*(V_G, \Lambda_\omega)$ as follows. We first define a total 3-point function

$$\Psi^G_{(V,\omega)}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \sum_A \Psi^G_{(A,0,3)}(pt; \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) q^A. \tag{1.17}$$

Then, we define an equivariant quantum multiplication by

$$(\alpha \times_{QG} \beta) \cup \gamma[V] = \Psi^G_{(V,\omega)}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3). \tag{1.18}$$

Theorem I: *(i) The equivariant quantum multiplication is commutative with the modulo structure of $H^*(BG)$.*

(ii) The equivariant quantum multiplication is skew-symmetry.

(iii) The equivariant quantum multiplication is associative.

Hence, there is a equivariant quantum ring structure for any G and symplectic manifold V

Equivariant quantum cohomology has already been defined for monotonic symplectic manifold by Lu [Lu].

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we work out the detail of the virtual neighborhood technique for Banach V-manifolds. In section 3, we prove that the virtual neighborhood technique can be applied to pseudo-holomorphic maps. In the section 4, we prove Theorem A, B, C, D, H and I. We prove Theorem E, Corollary F in section 5 and Theorem G in section 6.

The results of this paper was announced in a lecture at the IP Irvine conference in the end of March, 96. An outline of this paper was given in [R4]. During the preparation of this paper, we received papers by Fukaya and Ono [FO], B. Seibert [S], Li-Tian [LT3], Liu-Tian, were informed by Hofer/Salamon that they obtained some of the results of this paper independently using different methods. The author would like to thank G. Tian and B. Siebert for pointing out errors in the first draft and B. Siebert for suggesting a fix (Appendix) of an error in Lemma 2.5. The author would like to thank An-Min Li and Bohui Chen for the valuable discussions.

2 Virtual neighborhoods for V-manifolds

As we mentioned in the introduction, the configuration space $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ is not a smooth Banach V-manifold in general. But for the purpose of virtual neighborhood construction, we can treat it as a smooth Banach V-manifold. To simplify the notation, we will work in the category of Banach V-manifold in this section and refer to the next section for the proof that the construction of this section applies to $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$.

V-manifold is a classical subject dated back at least to [Sa1]. Let's have a briefly review about the basics of V-manifolds.

Definition 2.1: *(i).A Hausdorff topological space M is a n-dimensional V-manifold if for every point $x \in M$, there is an open neighborhood of the form U_x/G_x where U_x is a connected open subset of $\mathbf{R}^n$ and G_x is a finite group acting on U_x diffeomorphic-ally. Let $p_x : U_x \rightarrow U_x/G_x$ be the projection. We call (U_x, G_x, p_x) a coordinate chart of x. If $y \in U_x/G_x$ and (U_y, G_y, p_y) is a coordinate chart of y such that $U_y/G_y \subset U_x/G_x$, there is an injective smooth map $U_y \rightarrow U_x$ covering the inclusion $U_y/G_y \rightarrow U_x/G_x$.*

(ii). A map between V-manifolds $h : M \rightarrow M'$ is smooth if for every point $x \in M$, there are local charts $(U_x, G_x, p_x), (U'_{h(x)}, G'_{h(x)}, p'_{h(x)})$ of $x, h(x)$ such that locally h can be lift to a smooth map

$$h : U_x \rightarrow U'_{h(x)}.$$

(iii).$P : E \rightarrow M$ is a V-bundle if locally $P^{-1}(U_\alpha/G_\alpha)$ can be lift to $U_\alpha \times \mathbf{R}^k$. Furthermore, the lifting of a transition map is linear on $\mathbf{R}^k$.

Furthermore, we can define Banach V-manifold, Banach V-bundle in the same way.

An easy observation is that we can always choose a local chart (U_x, G_x, p_x) of x such that G_x is the stabilizer of x by shrinking the size of U_x. Furthermore, we can assume that G_x acts effectively and U_x is an open disk neighborhood of the origin x in a linear representation $(G_x, \mathbf{R}^n)$. We call such a chart *a good chart* and G_x a *local group.*

Notes that if S is a transverse section of a V-bundle, then $S^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth V-sub-manifold. But, it is well-known that the ordinary transversality theorems fail for V-manifolds. However, the differential calculus (differential form, orientability, integration, de Rham theory) extends over V-manifolds. Moreover, the theory of characteristic classes and the index theory also extend over V manifolds. We won't give any detail here. Readers can find a detail expository in [Sa1], [Sa2]. In summary, if we use differential analysis, we can treat a V-manifold as an ordinary smooth manifold. To simplify the notation, we will omit the word "V-manifold" without confusion when we work on the differential form and the integration.

Definition 2.2: *We call that M to be a fine V-manifold if any local V-bundle is dominated by a global oriented V-bundle. Namely, Let $U_\alpha \times_{\rho_\alpha} E/G_\alpha$ be a local V-bundle, where $\rho_\alpha : G_\alpha \to GL(E)$ is a representation. There is a global oriented V-bundle $E \to M$ such that $U_\alpha \times_{\rho_\alpha} E_\alpha/G_\alpha$ is a subbundle of E_{U_α/G_α}.*

By a lemma of Siebert (Appendix), $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ is fine.

In the rest of the section, we will assume that all the Banach V-manifolds are fine

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a fine Banach V-manifold defined by specifying Sobolov norm of some geometric object. Let $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{B}$ be a Banach V-bundle equipped with a metric and $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{F}$ be a smooth section defined by a nonlinear elliptic operator.

Definition 2.3: *$\mathcal{S}$ is a proper section if $\{x; ||\mathcal{S}(x)|| \leq C\}$ is compact for any constant C. We call $\mathcal{M}_S = \mathcal{S}^{-1}(0)$ the moduli space of F. We call $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ a compact- V triple if $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{F}$ is a Banach V-pair and $\mathcal{S}$ is proper.*

When $\mathcal{S}$ is proper, it is clear that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is compact.

Definition 2.4: *Let M be a compact topological space. We call (U, E, S) a virtual neighborhood of M if U is a finite dimensional oriented V-manifold (not necessarily compact), E is a finite dimensional V-bundle of U and S is a smooth section of E such that $S^{-1}(0) = M$. Suppose that $M_{(t)} = \bigcup_t M_t \times \{t\}$ is compact. We call $(U_{(t)}, S_{(t)}, E_{(t)})$ a virtual neighborhood cobordism if $U_{(t)}$ is a finite dimensional oriented V-manifold with boundary and $E_{(t)}$ is a finite dimensional V-bundle and $S_{(t)}$ is a smooth section such that $S^{-1}_{(t)}(0) = M_{(t)}$.*

Let L_x be the linearlization

$$\delta \mathcal{S}_x : T_x\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{F}_x, \tag{2.12}$$

where the tangent space of a V-manifold at x means the tangent space of U_α at x where U_α/G_α is a coordinate chart at x. Then, L_x is an elliptic operator. When $Coker L_x = 0$ for every $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{S}$

is transverse to the zero section and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth V-manifold of dimension $ind(L_x)$. The case we are interested in is the case that $CokerL_x \neq 0$ and it may even jump the dimension. The original version of following Lemma is erroneous. The new version is corrected by B. Siebert (appendix).

Lemma 2.5: *Suppose that* $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ *is a compact-V triple. There exists an open set* $\mathcal{U}$ *such that* $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{B}$ *and a finite dimensional oriented V-bundle* $\mathcal{E}$ *over* $\mathcal{U}$ *with a V-bundle map* $s : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{U}}$ *such that*

$$L_x + s(x, v) : T_x\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F} \tag{2.13}$$

is surjective for any $x \in \mathcal{U}$*. Furthermore, the linearlization of* s *is a compact operator.*

Proof: For each $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$, there is a good chart $(\tilde{U}_x, G_x, p_x)$. Suppose that $\tilde{U}_x$ is open disk of radius 1 in H for some Banach space H. Let $(\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{U}}, G_x, \pi_x)$ be the corresponding chart of $\mathcal{F}$. Let $H_x = CokerL_x$. Then, G_x acts on H_x. Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is compact, there is a finite cover $\{(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{U}_{x_i}, G_{x_i}, p_{x_i})\}_1^m$. Each $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{U}_{x_i} \times H_{x_i}/G_{x_i}$ is a local V-bundle. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is fine, there exists an oriented global finite dimensional V-bundle $\mathcal{E}_i$ over $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_i \frac{1}{2}U_{x_i}$ such that $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{U}_{x_i} \times H_{x_i}/G_{x_i}$ is a subbundle of $(\mathcal{E}_i)|_{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{U}_{x_i}/G_{x_i}}$. Let

$$\mathcal{E} = \oplus_i \mathcal{E}_i. \tag{2.14}$$

Next, we define s. Each element w of H_{x_i} can be extended to a local section of $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{U}_{x_i}}$. Then one can multiply it by a cut-off function ϕ such that $\phi = 0$ outside of the disk of radius $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\phi = 1$ on $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{U}_{x_i}$. Then, we obtain a section supported over $\tilde{U}_{x_i}$ (still denoted it by s). Define

$$\bar{s}_i(x, w) = s(x). \tag{2.15}$$

Then,

$$s_i(x, w) = \frac{1}{|G_{x_i}|} \sum_{g_i \in G_{x_i}} (g_i)^{-1} \bar{s}(g_i(x), g_i(w)). \tag{2.16}$$

By the construction, s_i descends to a map $U_{x_i} \times H_{x_i}/G_{x_i} \to \mathcal{F}_{U_{x_i}}$. Clearly, s_i can be viewed as a bundle map from $\mathcal{E}_i$ to $\mathcal{F}$ since it is supported in U_{x_i}. Moreover,

$$s(x_i, w) : (\mathcal{E}_i)_{x_i} \to H_{x_i} \subset \mathcal{F}_{x_i} \tag{2.17}$$

is projection. Then, we define

$$s = \sum s_i.$$

By (2.17), $L_x + s_i$ is surjective at x_i and hence it is surjective at a neighborhood of x_i. By shrinking U_{x_i}, we can assume that $L_x + s_i$ is surjective over $\frac{1}{2}U_{x_i}$. Hence, $L_x + s$ is surjective over $\mathcal{U}$. We have finished the proof. □

Next we define the extended equation

$$\mathcal{S}_e : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F} \tag{2.18}$$

by

$$\mathcal{S}_e(x, w) = \mathcal{S}(x) + s(x, w) \tag{2.19}$$

for $w \in E_x$. We call that s *a stabilization term* and $\mathcal{S}_e$ *a stabilization of* $\mathcal{S}$. $\mathcal{S}_e$ can be identified with a section of $\pi^*\mathcal{F}$ where $\pi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{U}$ is the projection. We shall use the same $\mathcal{S}_e$ to denote the corresponding section. Notes that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{S}_v^{-1}(0)$, where we view $\mathcal{U}$ as the zero section of $\mathcal{E}$. Moreover, its linearlization

$$(\delta \mathcal{S}_e)_{(x,0)}(\alpha, u) = L_x(\alpha) + s(x, u). \tag{2.20}$$

By lemma 2.5, it is surjective. Hence, $\mathcal{S}_e$ is a transverse section over a neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Since we only want to construct a neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$, without the loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathcal{S}_e$ is transverse to the zero section of $\pi^*\mathcal{F}$. Therefore,

$$U = (\mathcal{S} + s)^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{E} \tag{2.21}$$

is a smooth V-manifold of dimension $ind(L_x) + dim\mathcal{E}$. Clearly,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset U. \tag{2.22}$$

Lemma 2.5: *If $det(L_A)$ has a nowhere vanishing section, it defines an orientation of U.*

Proof: $T_{(x,w)}U = Ker(\delta \mathcal{S}_v)$ and $Coker(\delta \mathcal{S}_v) = 0$ by the construction. Hence, an orientation of U is equivalent to a nowhere vanishing section of $det(ind(\delta \mathcal{S}_v))$.

$$(\delta \mathcal{S}_v)_{(x,w)}(\alpha, u) = L_x(\alpha) + s(x, u) + \delta s_{(x,w)}(\alpha). \tag{2.13}$$

Let

$$(\delta^t \mathcal{S}_v)_{(x,w)}(\alpha, u) = L_x(\alpha) + ts(x, u) + t\delta s_{(x,w)}(\alpha). \tag{2.14}$$

Then,

$$det(ind(\delta\mathcal{S}_v)) = det(ind(\delta^t\mathcal{S}_v)) = det(ind(\delta^0\mathcal{S}_v)) = det(ind(L_x)) \otimes det(\mathcal{E}).$$

Therefore, a nowhere vanishing section of $det(ind(L_A))$ decides an orientation of U. □

Furthermore, we have the inclusion map

$$S : U \to \mathcal{E}, \tag{2.25}$$

which can be viewed as a section of $E = \pi^*\mathcal{E}$. S is proper since $\mathcal{S}$ is proper. Moreover,

$$S^{-1}(0) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{2.26}$$

Here, we construct a virtual neighborhood (U, E, S) of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. To simplify the notation, we will often use the same notation to denote the bundle (form) and its pull-back,

Notes that for any cohomology class $\alpha \in H^*(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{Z})$, we can pull back α over U. Suppose that it is represented by a closed differential form on U (still denoted it by α)

Definition 2.8: *Suppose that $det(ind(L_A))$ has a nowhere vanishing section so that U is oriented.*

(1). If $deg(\alpha) \neq ind(L_A)$, we define virtual neighborhood invariant $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}$ to be zero.

(2). When $deg(\alpha) = ind(L_A)$, choose a Thom form Θ supported in a neighborhood of zero section of E. We define

$$\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha) = \int_U \alpha \wedge S^*\Theta.$$

Remark: *In priori, μ_S is a real number. However, it was pointed to the author by S. Cappell that when α is a rational cohomology class, $\mu_S(\alpha)$ is a rational number. This is because both U, E have fundamental classes in compacted supported rational homology. Then, $\mu_S(\alpha)$ can be interpreted as paring with the fundamental class in rational cohomology.*

Proposition 2.9: *(1). $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}$ is independent of Θ, α.*

(2). $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}$ is independent of the choice of s and $\mathcal{E}$.

Proof: (1). If Θ' is another Thom-form supported in a neighborhood of zero section, there is a $(k-1)$-form θ supported a neighborhood of zero section such that

$$\Theta - \Theta' = d\theta. \tag{2.28}$$

Then,

$$\int_U \alpha \wedge S^*\Theta - \int_U \alpha \wedge S^*\Theta' = \int_U \alpha \wedge d(S^*\theta) = \int_U d(\alpha \wedge S^*\theta) = 0. \tag{2.28}$$

If α' is another closed form representing the same cohomology class, it is the same proof to show

$$\int_U \alpha \wedge S^*\Theta = \int_U \alpha' \wedge S^*\Theta. \tag{2.29}$$

To prove (2), suppose that $(\mathcal{E}', s')$ is another choice and (U', E', S') is the virtual neighborhood constructed by $(\mathcal{E}', s')$. Let Θ' be the Thom form of E' supported in a neighborhood of zero section. Consider

$$\mathcal{S}_e^{(t)} = \mathcal{S} + (1-t)s + ts' : \mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{E}' \times [0,1] \to \mathcal{F}. \tag{2.30}$$

Let $(U_{(t)}, \mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{E}', S_{(t)})$ be the virtual neighborhood cobordism constructed by $\mathcal{S}_e^{(t)}$. By Stokes theorem,

$$\int_{U_0} \alpha \wedge S_0^*(\Theta \wedge \Theta') - \int_{U_1} \alpha \wedge S_1^*(\Theta \wedge \Theta') = \int_{U_{(t)}} d(\alpha \wedge S_{(t)}^*(\Theta \wedge \Theta')) = 0, \tag{2.31}$$

since both α and $\Theta \wedge \Theta'$ are closed. It is easy to check that $U_0 = \pi^* E'$ where $\pi : E \to U$ is the projection, $S_0 = S \times Id$. Therefore,

$$\int_{U_0} \pi^*\alpha \wedge S_0^*(\Theta \wedge \Theta') = \int_U \alpha \wedge S^*(\Theta) = \int_U \alpha \wedge S^*(\Theta). \tag{2.32}$$

In the same way, one can show that

$$\int_{U_1} \alpha \wedge S_1^*(\Theta \wedge \Theta') = \int_{U'} \alpha \wedge (S')^*(\Theta').$$

We have finished the proof. □

Proposition 2.9: *Suppose that $\mathcal{S}_t$ is a family of elliptic operators over $\mathcal{F}_t \to \mathcal{B}_t$ such that $\mathcal{B}_{(t)} = \bigcup_t \mathcal{B}_t \times \{t\}$ is a smooth Banach V-cobordism and $\mathcal{F}_{(t)} = \bigcup_t \mathcal{F}_t \times \{t\}$ is a smooth V-bundle over $\mathcal{B}_{(t)}$. Furthermore, we assume that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_{(t)}} = \bigcup_t \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_t} \times \{t\}$ is compact. We call $(\mathcal{B}_{(t)}, \mathcal{F}_{(t)}, \mathcal{S}_{(t)})$ a compact-V cobordism triple. Then $\mu_{\mathcal{S}_0} = \mu_{\mathcal{S}_1}$.*

Proof: Choose $(\mathcal{E}_{(t)}, s)$ of $\mathcal{F}_{(t)} \to \mathcal{U}_{(t)}$ such that

$$\delta(\mathcal{S}^t + s) \tag{2.33}$$

is surjective to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{U}_{(t)}}$ where $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_{(t)}} \subset \mathcal{U}_{(t)} \subset \mathcal{B}_{(t)}$. Repeating previous argument, we construct a virtual neighborhood cobordism $(U_{(t)}, E_{(t)}, S_{(t)})$. Then, it is easy to check that (U_0, E_0, S_0) is a virtual neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}_0$ defined by $(\mathcal{E}_0, s(0))$ and (U_1, E_1, S_1) is a virtual neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}_1$ defined by $(\mathcal{E}_1, s(1))$. Applying the Stokes theorem as before, we have $\mu_{\mathcal{S}_0} = \mu_{\mathcal{S}_1}$. $\Box$

Recall that by [Sa2] one can define connections and curvatures on a V-bundle. Then, characteristic classes can be defined by Chern-Weil formula in the category of V-bundle. Next, we prove a proposition which is very useful to calculate $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Proposition 2.10: *(1) If F is a transverse section, $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}} \alpha$.*

(2) If $CokerL_A$ is constant and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a smooth V-manifold such that $dim(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}) = ind(L_A) + \dim CokerL_A$, $CokerL_A$ forms an obstruction V-bundle $\mathcal{H}$ over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. In this case,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}} e(\mathcal{H}) \wedge \alpha. \tag{2.34}$$

Before we prove the proposition, we need following lemma

Lemma 2.11: *Let $E \to M$ be a V-bundle over a V-manifold. Suppose that s is a transverse section of E. Then the Euler class $e(E)$ is dual to $s^{-1}(0)$ in the following sense: for any compact supported form α with $deg(\alpha) = \dim M - \dim E$,*

$$\int_M e(E) \wedge \alpha = \int_{s^{-1}(0)} \alpha. \tag{2.35}$$

Proof: When $\dim \mathcal{H} = \dim \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$, it is essentially Chern's proof of Gauss-Bonnett theorem. By [Sa2], Chern's proof in smooth case holds for V-bundle. For general case, it is an easy generalization of Chern's proof using normal bundle. We omit it. $\Box$

Proof of Proposition 2.10: (1) follows from the definition where we take $k = 0$.

To prove (2), let F_b be the eigenspace of Laplacian $L_A L_A^*$ of an eigenvalue b. Since $rank(CokerL_A)$ is constant, there is a $a \notin Spec(L_A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that the eigenspaces

$$F_{\leq a} = \oplus_{b \leq a} F_b = CokerL_A \tag{2.36}$$

has dimension $dimCoker(L_A)$ over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, the same is true for an open neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Without the loss of generality, we can assume that the open neighborhood is $\mathcal{U}$. Therefore $F_{\leq a}$ form a V-bundle (still denoted by $F_{\leq a}$) over $\mathcal{U}$ whose restriction over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is $\mathcal{H}$. In this case, we can choose s such that $s \in F_{\leq a}$ and s satisfy Lemma 2.4. Let (U, E, S) be the virtual neighborhood constructed from s. Recall that

$$U = (\mathcal{S}_e)^{-1}(0), \tag{2.37}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_e = \mathcal{S} + s. \tag{2.38}$$

Let

$$p_{\leq a} : \mathcal{F} \to F_{\leq a} \tag{2.39}$$

be the projection. Then,

$$\mathcal{S}_e = p_{\leq a}(\mathcal{S} + s) + (1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S} + s) = p_{\leq a}(\mathcal{S} + s) + (1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S}). \tag{2.40}$$

The last equation follows from the fact that $s \in F_{\leq a}$. So, $\mathcal{S}_e = 0$ iff

$$p_{\leq a}(\mathcal{S} + s) = 0 \text{ and } (1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S}) = 0. \tag{2.41}$$

By our assumption, $(1-p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S})$ is transverse to the zero section over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ since $Coker(L^A) = F_{\leq a}$. Therefore, we can assume that $(1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S})$ is transverse to the zero section over $\mathcal{U}$. Hence, $((1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S}))^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth V-manifold of dimension $ind(L_A) + \dim F_{\leq a} = ind(L_A) + \dim Coker(L_A)$. But

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset ((1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S}))^{-1}(0) \tag{2.42}$$

is a compact submanifold of the same dimension. Then, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ consists of the components of $((1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S}))^{-1}(0)$. In particular, other components are disjoint from $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Therefore, we can choose smaller $\mathcal{U}$ to exclude those components. Without the loss of generality, we can assume that

$$((1 - p_{\leq a})(\mathcal{S}))^{-1}(0) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{2.43}$$

Since $\mathcal{S} = 0$ over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$, the first equation of (2.31)becomes

$$p_{\leq a}(F + s) = s = 0. \tag{2.44}$$

Therefore, $U \subset E_{\mathcal{M}_s}$ and

$$U = s^{-1}(0). \tag{2.45}$$

However, s is a transverse section by the construction. By Lemma 2.11,

$$\int_U \alpha \wedge S^*(\Theta) = \int_{E_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}}} \pi^*(e(\mathcal{H}) \wedge \alpha) \wedge \Theta = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}} e(\mathcal{H}) \wedge \alpha, \tag{2.46}$$

since $S : E_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}} \to E_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}}$ is identity. Then, we proved (2). □

3 Virtual neighborhoods of Cauchy-Riemann equation

This is a technical section about the local structure of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ and Cauchy-Riemann equation. Roughly speaking, we will show that for all the applications of this article $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ behaves like a Banach V-manifold. Namely, $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ is VNA. If readers only want to get a sense of big picture, one can skip over this section.

There are roughly two steps in the virtual neighborhood construction. First step is to define an extended equation $\mathcal{S}_e$ by the stabilization. Then, we need to prove that (i) The set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e} = \{x, Coker D_x \mathcal{S}_v = \emptyset\}$ is open; (ii) $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{S}_e^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth, oriented V-manifold. Ideally, we would like to set up some Banach manifold structure on our configuration space and treat $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{S}_e^{-1}(0)$ as a smooth submanifold. However, there are some basic analytic difficulty against such an approach, which we will explain now. For $\mathcal{B}_A(Y, g, k)$, we allow the domain of the map to vary to accomendate the variation of complex structures of Riemann surfaces. Let's look at a simpler model. Suppose that $\pi : M \to N$ be a fiber bundle with fiber F. We want to put a Banach manifold structure on $\bigcup_{x \in N} C^k(\pi^{-1}(x))$. A natural way is to choose a local trivialization $\pi^{-1}(U) \cong U \times F$. It induces a trivialization $\bigcup_{x \in U} C^k(\pi^{-1}(x)) \to U \times C^k(F)$. Then, we can use the natural Banach manifold structure on $C^k(F)$ to induce a Banach manifold structure on $\bigcup_{x \in U} C^k(\pi^{-1}(x))$. However, if we have a different local trivialization, the transition function is a map $g : U \to Diff(F)$. The problem is that $Diff(F)$ only acts on $C^k(F)$ continuously. For example, suppose that ϕ_t is a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms generated by a vector field v. Then, the derivative of the path $f \circ g_t$ is $v(f)$, which decreases the differentiability of f by one. So we do not have a natural Banach manifold structure on $\bigcup_{x \in N} C^k(\pi^{-1}(x))$ in general. It is obvious that we have a natural Frechet manifold structure on $\bigcup_{x \in N} C^\infty(\pi^{-1}(x))$. However, we only care about the zero set $\mathcal{M}$ of some elliptic operator $\mathcal{S}_e$ defined over Frechet manifold $\bigcup_{x \in N} C^\infty(\pi^{-1}(x))$. The crucial observation is that locally we can choose any local trivialization and use Banach manifold structure induced from the local trivialization to show that $\mathcal{M}_U = \mathcal{M} \cap U \times C^k(F)$ is smooth. The elliptic regularity implies that $\mathcal{M}_U \subset U \times C^\infty(F)$. Although the transition map is not smooth for $C^k(F)$, but it is smooth on $\mathcal{M}_U$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}_U$ patches together to form a smooth manifold. Our strategy is to define the extended equation $\mathcal{S}_e$ over the space of C^∞-stable map. In each coordinate chart, we enlarge our space with Sobolev maps. Then, we can use usual analysis to show that the moduli space can be given a local coordinate chart of a smooth manifold. Elliptic regularity guarantees that every element of the moduli space is indeed smooth. Then, we show that the moduli space in each coordinate chart patches up to form a C^1-V-manifold.

Suppose that (Y, ω) is a family of symplectic manifold and J is a tamed almost complex structure. Choose a metric tamed with J.

Definition 3.1 ([PW], [Ye], [KM]). *Let* $(\Sigma, \{x_i\})$ *be a stable Riemann surface. A stable holomorphic map (associated with* $(\Sigma, \{x_i\})$*) is an equivalence class of continuous maps* f *from* Σ' *to* Y *such that* f *has the image in a fiber of* $Y \to X$ *and is smooth at smooth points of* Σ'*, where the domain* Σ' *is obtained by joining chains of* $\mathbf{P}^1$*'s at some double points of* Σ *to separate the two components, and then attaching some trees of* $\mathbf{P}^1$*'s. We call components of* Σ principal components *and others* bubble components*. Furthermore,*

(1) *If we attach a tree of* $\mathbf{P}^1$ *at a marked point* x_i*, then* x_i *will be replaced by a point different from intersection points on some component of the tree. Otherwise, the marked points do not change.*

(2) *The singularities of* Σ' *are normal crossing and there are at most two components intersecting at one point.*

(3) *If the restriction of* f *on a bubble component is constant, then it has at least three special points (intersection points or marked points). We call this component* a ghost bubble *[PW].*

(4) *The restriction of* f *to each component is* J*-holomorphic.*

Two such maps are equivalent if one is the composition of the other with an automorphism of the domain of f*.*

If we drop the condition (4), we simply call f *a stable map. Let* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$ *be the moduli space of stable holomorphic maps and* $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ *be the space of stable maps.*

Remark 3.2: *There are two types of automorphism here. Let* Aut_f *be the group of automorphisms* ϕ *of the domain of* f *such that* $f \circ \phi$ *is also holomorphic. This is the group we need to module out when we define* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$ *and* $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$*. It consists two kinds of elements. (1) When some bubble component is not stable with only one or two marked points, there is a continuous subgroup of* $PSL_2\mathbf{C}$ *preserving the marked points. (2) Another type of element comes from the automorphisms of domain interchanging different components, which form a finite group. Let* stb_f *be the subgroup of* Aut_f *preserving* f*. It is easy to see that* stb_f *is always a finite group. Type (1) elements of* stb_f *appear with multiple covered maps.*

Proposition 3.3: $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$ *(whose topology is defined later) is a stratified Hausdorff Frechet V-manifold of finite many strata.*

The proof consists of several lemmas.

Lemma 3.4: $\mathcal{B}_A(Y,g,k)$ *is a Hausdorff Frechet V-manifold for any* $2g+k\geq 3$ *or* $g=0, k\leq 2, A\neq 0$.

Proof: Recall

$$\mathcal{B}_A(Y,g,k)=\{(f,\Sigma);\Sigma\in\mathcal{M}_{g,k}, f:\Sigma\xrightarrow{F}Y\},\tag{3.1}$$

where $\xrightarrow{F}$ means that the image is in a fiber. When $2g+k\geq 3$, Σ is stable and $\mathcal{M}_{g,k}$ is a V-manifold. Hence, the automorphism group Aut_Σ is finite. Furthermore, there is a Aut_Σ-equivariant holomorphic fiber bundle

$$\pi_\Sigma: U_\Sigma\rightarrow O_\Sigma$$

such that O_Σ/Aut_Σ is a neighborhood of Σ in $\mathcal{M}_{g,k}$ and fiber $\pi^{-1}_\Sigma(b)=b$. Consider

$$\mathcal{U}_{\Sigma,f}=\{(b,h);h:b\xrightarrow{F}Y,h\in C^\infty.\}\tag{3.2}$$

As we discussed in the beginning of this section, $\mathcal{U}_{\Sigma,f}$ has a natural Frechet manifold structure. Let $stb_f\subset Aut_\Sigma$ be the subgroup preserving f. One can observe that $\mathcal{U}_{\Sigma,f}/stb_f$ is a neighborhood of (Σ,f) in $\mathcal{B}_A(Y,g,k)$. Hence, $\mathcal{B}_A(Y,g,k)$ is a Frechet V-manifold. Since only a finite group is involved, $\mathcal{B}_A(Y,g,k)$ is obviously Hausdorff.

For the case $g=0,k\leq 2,A\neq 0$, Σ is no longer stable and the automorphism group Aut_Σ is infinite. Here, we fix our marked points at 0 or 0, 1. First of all, stb_f is finite for any $f\in Map^F_A(Y,0,k)$ with $A\neq 0$.

$$\mathcal{B}_A(Y,g,k)=Map^F_A(Y,0,k)/Aut_\Sigma.$$

We first show that $B_A(Y,g,k)$ is Hausdorff. It requires showing that the graph

$$\Delta=\{(f,f\tau);f\in Map^F_A(Y,0,k),\kappa\in Aut_\Sigma\}\tag{3.3}$$

is closed. Suppose that $(f_n,f_n\tau_n)$ converges to (f,h) uniformly for all its derivatives. We claim that $\{\tau_n\}$ has a convergent subsequence. Suppose that ∞ is one of marked point which τ_n fixes. They, τ_n can be written as a_nz+b_n for $a_n\neq 0$.

Suppose that τ_n is degenerated. Then, (i)$b_n\rightarrow\infty$, (ii) $a_n\rightarrow 0$ or (iii) $a_n\rightarrow\infty$. In each case, we observe that τ_n converges pointwisely to τ which is either a constant map taking value ∞ or a map taking two different values. Since f_n converges uniformly, $f_n\tau_n$ converges to $f\tau$ pointwisely. Hence, $h = f\tau$ which is either a constant map or discontinous. We obtain a contradiction. Suppose that τ_n converges to τ. Then, $f_n\tau_n$ converges to $f\tau$. Therefore, Δ is closed.

Notes that

$$||df||_{L^2} \geq \omega(A). \tag{3.4}$$

Choose the standard metric on $\mathbf{P}^1$ with volume 1. Then, for a holomorphic map, there are points p (hence a open set of them) such that $df(p)$ is of maximal rank and $|df(p)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\omega(A)$. Since we only want to construct a neighborhood and the condition above is an open condition. Without the loss of generality, we assume that it is true for any f.

We marked extra points e_i such that $df(e_i)$ is of maximal rank, $|df(e_i)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\omega(A)$ and (Σ, e_i) has three marked points.

Next we construct a slice W_f of the action Aut_Σ. Note that $Map^F_A(Y, 0, k)$ is only a Frechet manifold. We can not use implicit function theorem. Since stb_f!is finite, we can construct a stb_f invariant metric on f^*TY by averaging the existing metric. Using stb_f invariant metric, the set

$$\{w \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FY); ||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon\} \tag{3.5}$$

is stb_f-invariant and open in C^∞-topology. Now, we fix the stb_f-invariant metric. For each extra marked point e_i constructed in previous paragraph, $df(e_i)$ is a 2-dimensional vector space. Clearly,

$$f_{e_i} = \oplus_{\tau \in stb_f} df(\tau(e_i)) \subset (T_{f(e_i)}Y)^{|stb_f|}$$

is stb_f-invariant. Now we want to construct a 2-dimensional subspace $E_{e_i} \subset f_{e_i}$ which is the orbit of action Aut_Σ. For simplicity, we assume that we only need one extra marked point e_1 to stabilize Σ. The proof of the case with two extra marked points is the same.

In this case, a neighborhood of id in Aut_Σ can be identified with a neighborhood of e_1 by the relation $\tau_x(e_1) = x$ for $x \in D^2(e_1)$. $\frac{d}{dx}\tau_x(f)(y)|_{x=e_1} = df(y)(v(y))$, where $v = \frac{d}{dx}\tau_x|_{x=e_1}$ is a holomorphic vector field. By our identification, v is decided by its value $v(e_1) \in T_{e_1}S^2$. Given any $v \in T_{e_1}S^2$, we use $v_{e_1} \in T_{id}Aut_\Sigma$ to denote its extension. Therefore, v decides $v_{e_1}(\tau(e_1))$. To get a precise relation, we can differentiate $\tau_x(\tau(e_1)) = \tau(\tau^{-1}\tau_x\tau)(e_1)$ to obtain

$$v_{e_1}(\tau(e_1)) = D\tau Ad_\tau(v), \tag{3.6}$$

where Ad_τ is the adjoint action.

$$E_{e_i} = \{\oplus_{\tau \in stb_f} df(\tau(e_1))(v_{e_1}(\tau(e_1))); v \in T_{e_1}S^2\} \tag{3.7}$$

It is easy to check that E_{e_1} is indeed stb_f-invariant. We can identify E_{e_1} with $T_{e_1}S^2$ by

$$v \to \oplus_{\tau \in stb_f} df(\tau(e_1))(D\tau Ad_\tau(v)), \tag{3.8}$$

Hence, E_{e_i} is 2-dimensional. Given any $w \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FY)$, we say that $w \perp E_{e_i}$ *if* $\oplus_{\tau \in stb_f} w(\tau(e_i))$ *is orthogonal to* E_{e_i}. The slice W_f can be constructed as

$$W_f = exp_f\{w \in \Omega(f^*T_FY); ||w||_{L_1^p} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon \text{ for } g \in stb_f, w \perp E_{e_i}\}, \tag{3.9}$$

where T_FY is the direct sum of vertical tangent bundle and P^*TX and δ_0 is a small fixed constant. We need to show that

(1) W_f is invariant under stb_f.

(2) If $h\tau \in W_f$ for $h \in W_f$, then $\tau \in Stb_f$.

(3) There is a neighborhood U of $id \in Aut$ such that the multiplication $F : U \times W_f \to Map_A^F(Y, 0, k)$ is a homeomorphism onto a neighborhood of f.

(1) follows from the definition. For (2), we claim that the set of τ satisfying (2) is close to an element of stb_f for small ϵ. If not, there is a neighborhood U_0 of stb_f and a sequence of (h_n, τ_n) such that $\tau_n \notin U_0$, h_n converges to f and $h_n\tau_n$ converges to f. By the previous argument, τ_n has a convergent subsequence. Without the loss of generality, we can assume that τ_n converges to $\tau \notin U_0$. Then, $h_n\tau_n$ converges to $f\tau = f$. This is a contradiction. By (1), we can assume that τ is close to identity. Then, (2) follows from (3).

Next we prove (3). Consider the local model around $f(\tau(e_1))$. Since $df(\tau(e_1))$ is injective, we can choose a local coordinate system of V such that $Im(f)$ is a ball of $\mathbf{C}_\tau \subset \mathbf{C}_\tau \times \mathbf{C}_\tau^{n-1}$ in which the origin corresponds to $f(\tau(e_1))$.. Furthermore, we may assume that the metric is standard. For any w, let

$$P(w) : \Omega^0(f^*T_FY) \to E_{e_1}.$$

be the projection Then, $w \in W_f$ iff $P(w) = 0$. Suppose that w is bounded.

(3.10)

$$\tau_x(w)(\tau(e_1)) = w(\tau_x(\tau(e_1))) + f(\tau_x(\tau(e_1))) - f(\tau(e_1)) + O(r^2) = w(\tau_x(\tau(e_1))) + f(\tau_x(\tau(e_1))) + O(r^2),$$

where $r = |\tau_x(\tau(e_1))|$. Then,

$$P(\tau_x(w)) = P(w \circ \tau_x) + P(f \circ \tau_x) + O(r^2). \tag{3.10.1}$$

Hence $P(\tau_x(w)) = 0$ iff $-P(w \circ \tau_x) = P(f \circ \tau_x) + O(r^2)$, where

$$P(w \circ \tau_x), P(f \circ \tau_x) : D^2 \to E_{e_1}. \tag{3.10.2}$$

Notes that $P(f \circ \tau_0) = 0$.

$$dP(f \circ \tau_x)(v)|_{x=0} = P(df(v_{e_1})). \tag{3.10.3}$$

Under the identification (3.8), $dP(f \circ \tau_x)_0$ is the identity. Let $\bar{f} = P(f \circ \tau_x)$. Then, $\bar{f}^{-1}$ exists and $d\bar{f}^{-1}$ is bounded on a small disc. Consider $\bar{w}(x) = \bar{f}^{-1}P(w \circ \tau_x + O(r^2))$. Then, $P(\tau_x(w)) = 0$ iff x is a fixed point of $\bar{w}$. Suppose that $\epsilon << 1$. Since $||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon$, $|\bar{w}(0)| < C\epsilon$. Furthermore, $|dw| < \epsilon$. $\bar{w} : D^2_{\delta_0} \to D^2_{\delta_0}$ for fixed δ_0. The small bound on the derivative also implies that $\bar{w}$ is a contraction mapping. Therefore, there is a unique fixed point $x(w)$ in D_{δ_0} and hence $\tau_w = \tau_x$. Moreover, $x(w)$ depends smoothly on w. Therefore, τ_w depends smoothly on w. We define $H(w) = (\tau_w^{-1}, f_w\tau_w)$. By our construction, H is continuous and an inverse of F. $\Box$

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$ has an obvious stratification indexed by the combinatorial type of the domain. The later can be viewed as the topological type of the domain as an abstract 2-manifold with marked points such that each component is associated with a nonzero integral 2-dimensional class A_i unless this component is genus zero with at least three marked points. Furthermore, each component is represented by a J-holomorphic map with fundamental class A_i and total energy is equal to $\omega(A)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{D}^{J,A}_{g,k}$ is the set of indices.

Lemma 3.5: *$\mathcal{D}^{J,A}_{g,k}$ is a finite set.*

Proof: Let $(A_1, \cdots, A_k)$ be the integral 2-dimensional nonzero classes associated with the components. The last condition implies that

$$\omega(A_i) > 0, \sum A_i = A. \tag{3.11}$$

In [RT1](Lemma 4.5), it was shown that the set of tuple (3.11) is finite. Therefore, the number of non-ghost components is bounded. We claim that the number of ghost bubbles is bounded by the number of non-ghost bubbles. Then, the finiteness of $\mathcal{D}^{J,A}_{g,k}$ follows automatically.

We prove our claim by the induction on the number of non-ghost bubbles. It is easy to observe that any ghost bubble must lie in some bubble tree T. By the construction, this ghost bubble can not lie on the tip of any branch. Otherwise, it has at most two marked points. Choose B to be the ghost bubble closest to the tip. We remove the subtree T_B with base B. Then, we obtain an abstract 2-manifold with marked points. If it is the domain of another stable map, we denote it by T'. If not, B is based on another ghost bubble B' with only three marked points. Then, we remove T_B and contract B' to obtain T' the domain of another stable map. Let $gh(T')$ be the number of ghost bubbles and $ngh(T')$ be the number of non-ghost bubbles. By the induction,

$$gh(T') \leq ngh(T'). \tag{3.12}$$

However,

$$gh(T) \leq gh(T') + 2, ngh(T_B) \geq 2.$$

Therefore,

$$gh(T) \leq ngh(T') + 2 \leq ngh(T) + ngh(T_B) = ngh(T). \tag{3.13}$$

We finish the proof. $\square$

For any $D \in \mathcal{D}^{J,A}_{g,k}$, let $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ be the set of stable maps whose domain and the corresponding fundamental class of each component have type D. Then, $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is a strata of $\mathcal{B}_A(Y, g, k)$.

Lemma 3.6: *$\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is a Hausdorff Frechet V-manifold.*

Proof: $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is a subset of $\prod_i \mathcal{B}_{A_i}(Y, \Sigma_i)$ such that the components intersect each other according to the intersection pattern specified by D. Therefore, it is Hausdorff. For the simplicity, let's consider the case that D has only two components. The general case is the same.

Let $D = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$ joining at $p \in \Sigma_1, q \in \Sigma_2$. Assume that A_i is associated with Σ_i. Then,

$$\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) = \{(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{B}_{A_1}(Y, g_1, k_1 + 1) \times \mathcal{B}_{A_2}(Y, g_2, k_2 + 1); f_1(p) = f_2(p)\}. \tag{3.14}$$

It is straightforward to show that $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is Frechet V-manifold with the tangent space

$$T_{(f_1, f_2)}\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) = \{(w_1, w_2) \in \Omega^0(f_1^* T_F V) \times \Omega^0(f_2^* T_F V); w_1(p) = w_2(q)\} \tag{3.15}$$

We leave it to readers. $\square$

Next, we discuss how different strata fit together. It amounts to show how a stable map deforms when it changes domain. A natural starting point is the deformation theory of the domain of stable maps as abstract nodal Riemann surfaces. However, it is well-known that unstable components cause a problem in the deformation theory. For example, the moduli space will not be Hausdorff.

To have a good deformation theory, we have to consider a map with its domain together for unstable components.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ be the space of stable Riemann surfaces. The important properties of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ are that (i) $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ is a V-manifold; (ii) there is a local universal V-family in following sense: for each $\Sigma \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$, let stb_Σ be its automorphism group. There is a stb_Σ-equivariant (holomorphic) fibration

$$\pi_\Sigma : U_\Sigma \to O_\Sigma \tag{3.16}$$

such that O_Σ/Aut_Σ is a neighborhood of Σ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ and the fiber $\pi_\Sigma^{-1}(b) = b$.

Suppose that the components of f are $(\Sigma_1, f_1), \cdots, (\Sigma_m, f_m)$, where $\Sigma_i \in \mathcal{M}_{g_i,k_i}$ is a marked Riemann surface. If Σ_i is stable, locally $\mathcal{M}_{g_i.k_i}$ is a V-manifold and have a local universal V-family. Suppose that they are

$$\pi : U_i \to O_i \tag{3.17}$$

divided by the automorphism group Aut_i of Σ_i preserving the marked points. Stability means that Aut_{Σ_i} is finite. However, the relevant group for our purpose is $stb_i = stb_{f_i} \subset Aut_i$. Suppose that $x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{ik_i}$ are the marked points. We choose a disc D_{ij} around each marked point x_{ij} invariant under $stab_{\Sigma_i}$. For each $\tilde{\Sigma}_i \in O_i$, x_{ij} may vary. We can find a diffeomorphism $\phi_\Sigma : \Sigma \to \tilde{\Sigma}_i$ to carry x_{ij} together with D_{ij} to the corresponding marked point and its neighborhood on $\tilde{\Sigma}_i$. Pulling back the complex structures by $\phi_{\tilde{\Sigma}_i}$, we can view O_i as the set complex structure on Σ_i which have the same marked points and moreover are the same on D_{ij}. $\phi_{\tilde{\Sigma}_i}$ gives a local smooth trivialization

$$\phi_\Sigma : U_i \to O_i \times \Sigma. \tag{3.18}$$

When Σ_i is unstable, Σ_i is a sphere with one or two marked points and we have to divide it by the subgroup Aut_i of $\mathbf{P}^1$ preserving the marked points. But to glue the Riemann surfaces, we have to choose a parameterization. Recall that $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(\Sigma_i) = Map^F_{A_i}(\Sigma_i, Y)/Aut_i$. For any $f_i \in Map^F_{A_i}(\Sigma_i, Y)$, one constructs a slice W_{f_i} (Lemma 3.4) at f_i such that W_{f_i}/stb_{f_i} is diffeomorphic to a neighborhood of $[f_i]$ in the quotient. Moreover, we only want to construct a neighborhood of f. To abuse notation, we identify $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(\Sigma_i)$ with the slice W_{f_i}/stb_{f_i}. Then, we can proceed as before. Fix a standard $\mathbf{P}^1$. We choose a disc D_{ij} $(j \leq 2)$ around each marked point invariant under stb_{f_i}. Then, $O_i = pt, U_i = \mathbf{P}^1$.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of the nodal points of Σ. For each $x \in \mathcal{N}$, we associate a copy of $\mathbf{C}$ (gluing parameter) and denote it by $\mathbf{C}_x$. Let $\mathbf{C}_f = \prod_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{C}_x$, which is a finite dimensional space. For each $v \in C_f$ with $|v|$ small and $\tilde{\Sigma}_i \in O_i$, we can construct a Riemann surface $\tilde{\Sigma}_v$. Suppose that

x is the intersection point of Σ_i, Σ_j and Σ_i, Σ_j intersect at $p \in \Sigma_i, q \in \Sigma_j$. For any small complex number $v_x = re^{iu}$. We construct $\Sigma_i \#_{v_x} \Sigma_j$ by cutting discs with radius $\frac{2r^2}{\rho}$-$D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho}), D_q(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})$, where ρ is a small constant to be fixed later. Then, we identify two annulus $N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{2r^2}{\rho}), N_q(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{2r^2}{\rho})$ by holomorphic map

$$(e^{i\theta}, t) \cong (e^{i\theta}e^{iu}, \frac{r^4}{t}). \tag{3.19}$$

Notes that (3.19) sends inner circle to outer circle and vis versus. Moreover, we identify the circle of radius r^2. Roughly speaking, we cut off the discs of radius r^2 and glue them together by rotating $e^{i\theta}$. When $v_x = 0$, we define $\Sigma_i \#_0 \Sigma_j = \Sigma_i \wedge \Sigma_j$-the one point union at $p = q$. Given any metric $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ on Σ, we can patch it up on the gluing region as follows. Choose coordinate system of $N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{2r^2}{\rho})$. The metric of Σ_1 is $t(ds^2 + dt^2)$ and the metric from Σ_2 is $\frac{r^4}{t}(ds^2 + dt^2)$. Suppose that β is a cut off function vanishing for $t < \frac{\rho r^2}{2}$ and equal to one for $t > \frac{2r^2}{\rho}$. We define a metric λ_v which is equal to λ outside the gluing region and

$$\lambda_v = (\beta t + (1 - \beta)\frac{r^4}{t})(ds^2 + dr^2) \tag{3.20}$$

over the gluing region. We observe that on the annulus $N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{2r^2}{\rho})$ the metric g_v has the same order as standard metric. For any complex structure on Σ_i which is fixed on the gluing region, it induces a complex structure on $\Sigma_i \#_{v_x} \Sigma_j$. If we start from the complex structure of $\tilde{\Sigma}$, by repeating above process for each nodal point we construct a marked Riemann surface $\tilde{\Sigma}_v$. Clearly, $\tilde{\Sigma}_0 = \tilde{\Sigma}$.

Remark 3.7: *The reader may wonder why we glue in a disc of radius r^2 instead of r. The reason is a technical one. If we use r, the gluing map is only continuous at $r = 0$. Using r^2, we can show that the gluing map is C^1 at $r = 0$.*

Let

$$\tilde{O}_f = \prod_i O_i \times \mathbf{C}_f. \tag{3.21}$$

The previous construction yields a universal family

$$\tilde{U}_f = \cup\{\tilde{\Sigma}_v; \tilde{\Sigma} \in \prod_i O_f, v \in \mathbf{C}_f \text{ small }\}. \tag{3.22}$$

The projection

$$\pi_f : \tilde{U}_f \to \tilde{O}_f \tag{3.23}$$

maps $\tilde{\Sigma}_v$ to $(\tilde{\Sigma}, v)$. We still need to show that (3.23) is stb_f-equivariant. $\prod_i stb_i$ induces an obvious action on (3.23). There are other types of automorphisms of Σ by switching the different components and stb_f is a finite extension of $\prod_i stb_i$ by such automorphisms. The gluing construction with perhaps different gluing parameter is clearly commutative with such automorphisms. Hence, stb_f acts on (3.23). $(\tilde{U}_f, \tilde{O}_f)/stb_f$ is the local deformation of domain we need. After we stabilize the unstable component, $\tilde{\Sigma}_v$ should be viewed as an element of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+l}$, where l is the number of extra marked points. Hence, $\tilde{O}_f \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+l}$ and $\tilde{U}_f$ is just the local universal family of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+l}$. Forgetting the extra marked points, we map $\tilde{O}_f$ to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ by the map

$$\pi_{k+l} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+l} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \tag{3.24}$$

Suppose that the extra marked points are $e^v_1, \cdots, e^v_l$. Sometimes, we also use notation $e^f_1, \cdots e^f_l$.

To describe a neighborhood of f, without the loss of generality, we can assume that $dom(f) = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$ and $f = (f_1, f_2)$, where Σ_1, Σ_2 are marked Riemann surfaces of genus g_i and $k_i + 1$ many marked points such that $g = g_1 + g_2, k = k_1 + k_2$. Furthermore, suppose that Σ_1, Σ_2 intersects at the last marked points p, q of Σ_1, Σ_2 respectively. The general case is identical and we just repeat our construction for each nodal point. In this case, the gluing parameter v is a complex number. We choose v small enough such that marked points other than p, q are away from the gluing region described above. Let $f_1(p) = f_2(q) = y_0 \in V \subset Y$. Let $U_{P(y_0)}$ be a small neighborhood of $P(y_0) \in X$. We can assume that $P^{-1}(U_{y_0}) = V \times U_{P(y_0)}$ and $y_0 = (x_0, x_1)$. Suppose that the fiber exponential map $exp : T_{x_0}V \to V \times \{x\}$ is a diffeomorphism from $B_\epsilon(x_0, T_{x_0}V)$ onto its image for any $x \in U_{P(y_0)}$, where B_ϵ is a ball of radius ϵ. Furthermore, we define

$$f^w = exp_f w. \tag{3.25}$$

Next, we construct attaching maps which define the topology of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$. First we construct a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{f,D}/stb_f$ of $f \in \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$. Recall that if $dom(f) = \Sigma$ is an irreducible stable marked Riemann surface, then a neighborhood of f can be described as

$$O_f \times \{f^w; w \in \Omega^0(f^* T_F Y), ||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon\} \tag{3.26}$$

divided by stb_f.

If Σ is unstable, we needs to find a slice W_f. By lemma 3.4, we mark additional points e^f_i on Σ such that Σ has three marked points. We call the resulting Riemann surface $\bar{\Sigma}$. Furthermore, we choose e^f_i such that $df_{e^f_i}$ is of maximal rank. Then,

$$W_f = \{f^w; w \in \Omega^0(f^* T_F Y); ||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon, g \in sbt_f, w \perp E_{e^f_i}\}. \tag{3.28}$$

If $dom(f) = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$ joining at $p \in \Sigma_1, q \in \Sigma_2$ and $f = f_1 \wedge f_2$, We define

$$\Omega^0(f^*T_FY) = \{(w_1, w_2) \in \Omega^0(f_1^*T_FY) \times \Omega^0(f_2^*T_FY); w_1(p) = w_2(q), w \perp E_{e_i^f}\}. \tag{3.29}$$

A neighborhood of f in $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is

$$\prod_i O_i \times \{f^w; w \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FY), ||w||_{L_1^p} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon, g \in sbt_f, w \perp E_{e_i^f}\}/stb_f. \tag{3.30}$$

If $dom(f)$ is an arbitrary configuration, we repeat above construction over each nodal point to define $\Omega^0(f^*T_FY)$. A neighborhood of f in $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is

(3.31)

$$\mathcal{U}_{f,D} = \prod_i O_i \times \{f^w; w \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FV), ||w||_{L_1^p} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon, g \in sbt_f, w \perp E_{e_i^f}\}/stb_f.$$

We want to construct an attaching map

$$\bar{f}^{w,v} : \mathcal{U}_{f,D} \times \mathbf{C}_f^\epsilon \to \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$$

invariant under stb_f, where $\mathbf{C}_f^\epsilon$ is a small ϵ-ball around the origin of $\mathbf{C}_f$. We simply denote

$$\bar{f}^v = \bar{f}^{0,v}. \tag{3.32}$$

Again, let's focus on the case that $D = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$ and the general case is similar. Recall the previous set-up. $f_1(p) = f_2(q) = y_0 = (x_0, x_1) \in V \subset Y$. Let $U_{P(y_0)}$ be a small neighborhood of $P(y_0) \in X$. We can assume that $P^{-1}(U_{y_0}) = V \times U_{P(y_0)}$ and $y_0 = (x_0, x_1)$. Suppose that the fiber exponential map $exp : T_{x_0,x}V \to V \times \{x\}$ is a diffeomorphism from $B_\epsilon(x_0, T_{x_0}V)$ to its image for any $x \in U_{P(y_0)}$. In the construction of $dom(f)_v$, we can choose r small enough such that

$$f_1^w(D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})), f_2^w(D_q(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})) \subset B_\epsilon(x_0, T_{x_0}V) \times P(y_1'),$$

for any $w \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FY)$ and $||w||_{C^1} < \epsilon$. Following [MS], we choose a special cut-off function as follows. Define β_ρ to be the involution of the function

$$1 - \frac{log(t)}{log\rho}. \tag{3.33}$$

for $t \in [\rho, 1]$ and equal to $0, 1$ for $t < \rho, t > 1$ respectively. This function has the property that

$$\int |\bigtriangledown \beta|^2 < \frac{C}{-log\rho}.$$

Such a cut-off function was first introduced by Donaldson and Kroheimer [DK] in 4-dimension case. We refer to [DK], [MS] for the discussion of the importance of such a cut-off function. Then, we define

$$\bar{\beta}_r(t) = \beta(\frac{2t}{r^2}), \tag{3.34}$$

which is a cut-off function for the annulus $N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2})$. Clearly, $\bar{\beta}_r$ is the convolution of the function

$$1 - \frac{log(\frac{2t}{r^2})}{log\rho}. \tag{3.35}$$

Let $\Sigma^w = dom(f^w)$, where we have already marked the extra marked $e_1^v, \cdots, e_l^v$ to stabilize the unstable components. Then, we define

$$f^{v,w} : \Sigma^w_v \to Y$$

as

$$f^{v,w} = \begin{cases} f_1^w(x); x \in \Sigma_1 - D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ \bar{\beta}_r(t)(f_1^w(s,t) - y_w) + f_2(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}); x = re^{i\theta} \in N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2}) \cong N_q(2r^2, \frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ f_1^w(s,t) + f_2^w(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}) - y_w; x = re^{i\theta} \in N_p(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2) \cong N_q(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2) \\ \bar{\beta}_r(t)(f_2^w(s,t) - y_w) + f_1(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}); x = re^{i\theta} \in N_q(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, r^2) \cong N_p(r^2, \frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ f_2^w(x); x \in \Sigma_2 - D_q(\frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \end{cases} \tag{3.36}$$

where $y_w = f_1^w(p) = f_2^w(q)$. To get an element of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$, we have to view $f^{w,v}$ as a function $\pi_{k+l}(\tilde{\Sigma}_v)$ by forgetting the extra marked points. We denote it by $\bar{f}^{w,v}$.

There is a right inverse of the map $f^{v,w}$ defined as follows. Suppose that

$$f : \Sigma^w_v \to Y. \tag{3.37}$$

Let $b\tilde{eta}_r(t)$ be a cut-off function on the interval $(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2)$, which is symmetry with respect to $t = r^2$. Namely,

$$\tilde{\beta}_r(t) = 1 - \tilde{\beta}_r(-2t + 3r^2), \text{ for } t < r^2 \ .$$

We define

$$f_v = (f_v^1, f_v^2) : \Sigma_1^w \wedge \Sigma_2^w \to Y. \tag{3.38}$$

by

$$f_v^1 = \begin{cases} f(x); x \in \Sigma_1 - D_p(2r^2) \\ \tilde{\beta}_r(f(x) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1} f(s, r^2)) + \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1} f(s, r^2); x \in D_p(2r^2) \end{cases} \tag{3.39}$$

$$f_v^2 = \begin{cases} f(x); x \in \Sigma_2 - D_q(2r^2) \\ \tilde{\beta}_r(f(x) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1} f(s, r^2)) + \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1} f(s, r^2); x \in D_q(2r^2) \end{cases} \tag{3.40}$$

Roughly speaking, we cut the f over the annulus with $\frac{r^2}{2} < t < 2r^2$.

By the construction, the attaching map is really the composition of two maps. The intermediate object is

(3.41)

$$\mathcal{U}_f = \bigcup_{\tilde{\Sigma}_v \in \tilde{O}_f} \{exp_{f^v}\{w \in \Omega^0((f^v)^* T_F^* Y); w \perp E_{e_i^f}, ||w||_{L_1^p} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon, g \in sbt_f\}\}.$$

$\mathcal{U}_f$ is clearly a stratified Frechet V-manifold. Then,

$$f^{\cdot\cdot} : \mathcal{U}_{f,D} \times \mathbf{C}_f^\epsilon \to \mathcal{U}_f \tag{3.42}$$

and

$$\{\bar{.}\} : \mathcal{U}_f \to \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k). \tag{3.43}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{U}_f} = Im(\mathcal{U}_f)$ under $\{\bar{.}\}$.

The different gluing parameters give rise to different $\tilde{\Sigma}_v \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+l}$. However, we want to study the injectivity of attaching map, where we have to consider $\bar{f}^{w,v}$. It would be more convenient to construct $\pi_{k+l}(\tilde{\Sigma}_v)$ directly. We shall give such an equivalent description of gluing process.

Recall that the domain of a stable map can be constructed by first adding a chain of $\mathbf{P}^1$'s to separate double point and then add trees of $\mathbf{P}^1$'s. Now we distinguish principal components and bubble components in our construction. We first glue the principal components. In this case, the different gluing parameters give rise to the different marked Riemann surfaces. Then, we glue the maps according to formula (3.36). When we glue a bubble component, we gives an equivalent description. Suppose that Σ_i is a stable Riemann surface and Σ_j is a bubble component. Moreover, Σ_i, Σ_j intersects at $p \in \Sigma_i, q \in \Sigma_j$. Suppose that the gluing parameter is $v = re^{i\theta}$. We can view the previous construction as follow. We cut off the balls $D_i^p \subset \Sigma_i, D_j^q \subset \Sigma_j$ of radius $\frac{2r^2}{\rho}$ centered at marked points we want to glue. The complement $\Sigma_j - D_j$ is conformal equivalent to a ball of radius $\frac{2r^2}{\rho}$. Then, we glue back the disc along the annulus by rotating angel θ. Clearly, this is just a different parameterization of Σ_i. But we do obtain a holomorphic map from $\Sigma_i \#_v \Sigma_j$ to Σ_i. Furthermore, we obtain a local universal family

$$\bar{\tilde{U}}_f \to \bar{\tilde{O}}_f \tag{3.44}$$

of $\Sigma = dom(f)$ as an element of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$. Although $\Sigma_i \#_v \Sigma_j$ is just Σ_i in our alternative gluing construction, the different gluing parameters may give different maps. Let τ_v be the composition of rescaling and rotation conformal transformations described above. Let e_i be the marked points of Σ_j other than q. We observe that τ_v rescaled $|df(e_i)|$ at the order $\frac{1}{r^2}$. Then, we repeat above construction for each bubble component.

Lemma 3.8: *Suppose that* $\bar{f}^{v,w} = \bar{f}^{v',w'}$. *Then,*

$$v = v'.\ mod\ (stb_f) \tag{3.45}$$

As we mentioned above, $\Sigma_v^w \neq \Sigma_{v'}^{w'}$ if $v \neq v'$. If $\pi_{k+l}(\Sigma_v^w) \neq \pi_{k+l}(\Sigma_{v'}^{w'})$,

$$\bar{f}^{v,w} \neq \bar{f}^{v',w'} \tag{3.46}$$

by the definition. If $\pi_{k+l}(\Sigma_v^w) = \pi_{k+l}(\Sigma_{v'}^{w'})$, there are two possibilities. Since $\pi_{k+1}(\Sigma_v^w)$ is the quotient of $\bar{\Sigma}_v^w$ by $stb_{\bar{\Sigma}_v^w}$, either $\bar{\Sigma}_v^w = \bar{\Sigma}_{v'}^{w'}$ or they are different by an element of $stb_{\bar{\Sigma}_v^w} \subset stb_f$. Since the attaching map is invariant under stb_f, we can apply this element to (w', v'). Therefore, we can just simply assume that $\bar{\Sigma}_v^w = \bar{\Sigma}_{v'}^{w'}$. On the other hand, Σ_v^w is just $\bar{\Sigma}_v^w$ with additional marked points $e_1^v, \cdots, e_l^v$. Then, it is enough to show that

$$e_i^v = e_i^{v'}.\ \mathrm{mod}\ (stb_f) \tag{3.47}$$

Suppose that Σ_j contains extra marked point e_s. We choose small r such that

$$\frac{1}{r^2} >> \frac{max\{|df_1^w||df_1^{w'}|\}}{min\{|df_2^w(e_s)|, |df_2^{w'}(e_s)|\}}.$$

When ϵ is small, $|df_2^w(e_s)|, |df_2^{w'}(e_s)| > 0$. Therefore, we can assume that

$$|d(\tau_v f)_2^w(e_s)|, |d(\tau_v) f_2^{w'}(e_s)| > max\{|df_1^w|, |df_1^{w'}|\}. \tag{3.48}$$

Hence, $\tau(e_s^v), \tau(e_s^{v'}) \in D_i^p \cap D_j^{p'}, \tau \in stb_{f_i}$. Furthermore,

$$\tau_v f^w = \tau_{v'} f^{w'}. \tag{3.49}$$

on a smaller open subset D_0 of $D_i^p \cap D_j^{p'}$ containing $\tau(e_s^v), \tau(e_s^{v'})$. Hence,

$$f^{w'} = \tau_{v'}^{-1} \tau_v f^w. \tag{3.50}$$

on an open set containing e_s. However, both $f^w, f^{w'}$ are in the slice W_f. Hence, (3.50) is valid for $f^w, f^{w'}$ over a component of Σ_f containing $e^v_s, e^{v'}_s$. Hence

$$\tau_{v'}^{-1}\tau_v \in stb_f. \tag{3.51}$$

Therefore,

$$e^v_s = e^{v'}_s. \text{ mod } (stb_f) \tag{3.52}$$

Furthermore, we also observe that

$$f^w = f^{w'} \text{ on } \Sigma - \bigcup D_{ij}. \tag{3.53}$$

□

$\bar{.}$ is obviously invariant under stb_f. Moreover,

Lemma 3.9: *The induced map of* $\{\bar{.}\}$ *from* $\mathcal{U}_f/stb_f$ *to* $\tilde{\mathcal{U}_f} \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ *is one-to-one. Furthermore, the intersection of* $\tilde{\mathcal{U}_f}$ *with each strata is open and homeomorphic to the corresponding strata of* $\mathcal{U}_f$.

Proof: Let

$$\mathcal{V}_f = \mathcal{U}_{f,D} \times \mathbf{C}_f.$$

By (3.39), (3.40), $f^{v,w}$ is onto. Suppose that $\bar{f}^{v,w} = \bar{f}^{v',w'}$. By the Lemma 3.8, $v = v'$ mod(stb_f). Therefore, we can assume that $v = v'$. Moreover, we can assume that $\Sigma^w_v = \Sigma^{w'}_{v'}$. However, it is obvious that

$$\bar{.} : Map^F_A(\Sigma^w_v) \to \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$$

is injective. So we show that

$$f^{w,v} = f^{w',v'}. \tag{3.54}$$

To prove the second statement, let $w_0 \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FY)$ with $w_0 \perp E_{e^f_i}$. For any map close to $\bar{f}^{v,w_0}$, it is of the form f^{v,w_0+w} with $||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon, ||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon$. We want to show that we can perturb e^f_i such that

$$w_0 + w \perp E_{e^f_i}. \tag{3.55}$$

The argument of Lemma 3.4 applies.

Now we define the topology of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ by specifying the converging sequence.

Definition 3.10: *A sequence of stable maps* f_n *converges to* f *if for any* $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_f$*, there is* $N > 0$ *such that if* $n > N$ $f_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_f$*. Furthermore,* f_n *converges to* f *in* C^∞*-topology in any compact domain away from the gluing region.*

Proposition 3.11: *If a sequence of stable holomorphic maps weakly converge to* f *in the sense of [RT1], they converge to* f *in the topology defined in the Definition 3.8.*

The proof is delayed after Lemma 3.18.

Define

$$\chi : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \tag{3.56}$$

by $\chi(f) = \pi_{k+l}(dom(f))$.

Corollary 3.12: χ *is continuous.*

The proof follows from the definition of the topology of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$.

Theorem 3.13: $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ *is Hausdorff.*

Proof: Suppose that $f \neq f'$. By the corollary 3.12, we can assume that $\pi_{k+l}(dom(f)) = \pi_{k+l}(dom(f')$. We want to show that $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_f \cap \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{f'} = \emptyset$ for some ϵ. Suppose that it is false. We claim that $dom(f), dom(f')$ have the same topological type. Namely, f, f' are in the same strata. We start from the underline stable Riemann surfaces $\pi_{k+l}(dom(f)) = \pi_{k+l}(dom(f'))$ which are the same by the assumption. We want to show that they always have the same way to attach bubbles to obtain $dom(f), dom(f')$. Suppose that we attach a bubble to $\pi_{k+l}(dom(f))$ at p. Recall that the energy concentrates at $D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})$,i.e., $\int_{D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})} |df|^2 \geq \epsilon_0$. The same is true for $f^{w,v}$ when $||w||_{L_1^p} < \epsilon$. On the other hand, we have the same property for $(f')^{w',v'}$ for some $||w'||_{L_1^p}, |v'| < \epsilon$. If $\bar{f}^{w,v} = \bar{f'}^{w',v'}$, f' must have a bubbling point in $D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})$. In fact, the bubbling point must be p. Otherwise, we can construct a small ball $D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})$ containing no bubbling points of f'. Then, we proceed inductively on the next bubble. Now the energy concentrates at a ball of radius $r^2 r_1^2$, where $r_1 = |v_1|$ is the next gluing parameter. By the induction, we can show that $dom(f), dom(f')$ have the same topological type. In fact, we proved that $dom(f), dom(f')$ have the same bubbling points and hence the same holomorphic type.

Suppose that $f, f' \in \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$. Then, some component of f, f' are different. Suppose that the component $f_i \neq f'_i$, where $f_i, f'_i \in \mathcal{B}_{A_i}(Y, g, k)$. Note that f_i^v is equal to f outside the gluing region. $f^v \neq (f')^v$ for small v. By Lemma 3.4, $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(Y, g, k)$ is Hausdorff and the neighborhoods of

f_i, f_i' are described by slice $W_{f_i}, W_{f_i'}$ for a small constant ϵ. Add extra marked points to stabilize unstable components. $||f_i - f_i'||_{L_1^p} \geq 2\epsilon$ for small ϵ. Then, it is obvious that

$$W_{f_i} \cap W_{f_i'} = \emptyset. \tag{3.57}$$

Note that $f^{w,v}(e_0) = f^w(e_0), f^{w',v'}(e_0) = f^{w'}(e_0)$. It is straightforward to check that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_f \cap \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{f'} = \emptyset \tag{3.58}$$

for the same ϵ. This is a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.14: $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k)$ *is Hausdorff.*

To construct the obstruction bundle $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g, k)$, we start from the top strata $\mathcal{B}_A(Y, g, k)$. Let $\mathcal{V}(Y)$ be vertical tangent bundle. With an almost complex structure J, we can view $\mathcal{V}(Y)$ as a complex vector bundle. Therefore, for each $f \in \mathcal{B}_A(Y, g, k)$ we can decompose

$$\Omega^1(f^*\mathcal{V}(Y)) = \Omega^{1,0}(f^*\mathcal{V}(Y)) \oplus \Omega^{0,1}(f^*\mathcal{V}(Y)). \tag{3.59}$$

Both bundles patch together to form Frechet V-bundles over $\mathcal{B}_A(Y, g, k)$. We denote them by $\Omega^{1,0}(\mathcal{V}(Y)), \Omega^{0,1}(\mathcal{V}(Y))$. Then,

$$\mathcal{F}_A(Y, g, k) = \Omega^{0,1}(\mathcal{V}(Y)). \tag{3.60}$$

For lower strata $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$, $\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) \subset \prod_i \mathcal{B}_{A_i}(Y, g_i, k_i)$, where $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(Y, g_i, k_i)$ are components. When a component is stable, we already have an obstruction bundle $\mathcal{F}_{A_i}(Y, g, k)$. When the i-th component is unstable, we first form the obstruction bundle over $Map^F_{A_i}(Y, , 0, k_i)$ in the same way and divide it by Aut_i. In the quotient, we obtain a V-bundle denoted by $\Omega^{0,1}(\mathcal{V}(Y))$. Let

$$i : \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) \to \prod_i \mathcal{B}_{A_i}(Y, g_i, k_i) \tag{3.61}$$

be inclusion. We define

$$\mathcal{F}_D(Y, g, k) = i^* \prod_i \mathcal{F}_{A_i}(Y, g_i, k_i). \tag{3.62}$$

Finally, we define

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g, k)|_{\mathcal{B}_D(Y,g,k)} = \mathcal{F}_D(Y, g, k). \tag{3.63}$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$, consider a chart $(\mathcal{U}_f, V_f, stb_f)$. Suppose that $D = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$. For $\eta^w \in \Omega^{0,1}((f^w)^*\mathcal{V}(Y))$, define

$$\eta^{w,v} \in \Omega^{0,1}((f^{w,v})^*\mathcal{V}(Y))$$

by

$$\eta^{w,v} = \begin{cases} \eta_1(x); x \in \Sigma_1 - D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ \bar{\beta}_r(t)\eta_1(s,t) + \eta_2(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}); x = te^{is} \in N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2}) \cong N_q(2r^2, \frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ \eta_1(s,t) + \eta_2(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}); x = te^{is} \in N_p(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2) \cong N_q(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2) \\ \bar{\beta}_r(t)\eta_2(s,t) + \eta_1(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}); x = te^{is} \in N_q(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2}) \cong N_p(2r^2, \frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ \eta_2; x \in \Sigma_2 - D_q(\frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \end{cases} \tag{3.64}$$

$\bar{\partial}_J$ is clearly a continuous section of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y,g,k,J)$. Let $\bar{\partial}_{J,D}$ be the restriction of $\bar{\partial}_J$ over $\mathcal{B}_D$.

Next, we define the local sections by repeating the constructions in section 2. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_D(Y,g,k)$. $Coker D_f \bar{\partial}_{J,D}$ is a finite dimensional subspace of $\Omega^{0,1}(f^*\mathcal{V}(Y))$ invariant under stb_f. We first choose a stb_f-invariant cut-off function vanishing in a small neighborhood of the intersection points. Then we multiple it to the element of $Coker D_f \bar{\partial}_{J,D}$ and denote the resulting finite dimensional space as F_f. By the construction, F_f is stb_f-invariant. When the support of the cut-off function is small, F_f will have the same dimension as $Coker D_f \bar{\partial}_J$ and

$$D_f \bar{\partial}_{J,D} + Id : \Omega^0(f^* T_F Y) \oplus F_f \to \Omega^{0,1}(f^*\mathcal{V}(Y))$$

is surjective. We first extend each element s of F_f to a smooth section $s^w \in \Omega^{0,1}((f^w)^*\mathcal{V}(Y))$ of $\mathcal{F}_D(Y,g,k,J)$ supported in $U_{f,D}$ such that it's value vanishes in a neighborhood of the intersection points. Hence, s^w can be naturally viewed as an element of $\Omega^{0,1}((f^{w,v})^*\mathcal{V}(Y))$ supported away from the gluing region. Let β_f be a smooth cut-off function on a polydisc $\mathbf{C}_f$ vanishing outside of a polydisc of radius $2\delta_1$ and equal to 1 in the polydisc of radius δ_1. One can construct β_f by first constructing such β over each copy of gluing parameter $\mathbf{C}_x$ and then multiple them together. We now extend s^w over $\mathcal{U}_f$ by the map

$$s^v_c(f^{w,v}) = \beta_f(v) s^w. \tag{3.65}$$

Then, we use the method of the section 2 (2.5) to extend the identity map of F_f to a map

$$s_f : F_f \to \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y,g,k)|_{\mathcal{U}_f}. \tag{3.65.1}$$

invariant under stb_f and supported in $\mathcal{U}_f$. Then, it descends to a map over $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$. We will use s_f to denote the induced map on $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)$ as well. We call such s_f *admissible*. Our new equation will be of the form

$$\mathcal{S}_e = \bar{\partial}_f + \sum_i s_{f_i} : \mathcal{E} \to \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y,g,k,J), \tag{3.66}$$

where s_{f_i} is admissible. We observe that the restriction $\mathcal{S}_D$ of $\mathcal{S}$ over each strata is smooth. Let $U_{\mathcal{S}_e} = (\mathcal{S}_e)^{-1}(0)$ and

$$S : U_{\mathcal{S}_e} \to E.$$

Lemma 3.15: *S is a proper map.*

Proof: Since the value of s_{f_i} is supported away from the gluing region, the proof of lemma is completely same as the case to show that the moduli space of stable holomorphic maps is compact. We omit it. □

For $f \in \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$, we define the tangent space

$$T_f\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) = T_f\mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) \times \mathbf{C}_f$$

and the derivative

$$D_{f,t}\mathcal{S}_e = D_{f,t}\mathcal{S}_e|_{\mathcal{B}_D(Y,g,k)} : T_f\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \to \Omega^{0,1}(f^*\mathcal{V}(Y)). \tag{3.67}$$

Lemma 3.16:

$$IndD_{f,t}\mathcal{S} = 2C_1(V)(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2k + \dim X + dimE. \tag{3.68}$$

Proof:

$$D_{f,t}\mathcal{S}_D(W, u) = D_f\bar{\partial}_J(W) + \sum_i D_{f,t}s_{f_i}(W, u). \tag{3.69}$$

$$IndD_{f,t}\mathcal{S}_D = IndD_f\bar{\partial}_J + dimE.$$

If $\Sigma_f = dom(f)$ is irreducible, the lemma follows from Riemann-Roch theorem. Suppose that $\Sigma_f = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$ and $f = (f_1, f_2)$ with $f_1(p) = f_2(q)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
IndD_f\bar{\partial}_J &= IndD_{f_1}\bar{\partial}_J + IndD_{f_2}\bar{\partial}_J - dimY \\
&= 2C_1(V)([f_1]) + 2(3-n)(g_1-1) + 2(k_1+1) + \dim X + 2C_1(V)([f_2]) + 2(3-n)(g_2-1) \\
&\quad +2(k_2+1) + \dim X - \dim Y \\
&= 2C_1(V)(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2k + \dim X - 6 + 2n + 2 - 2n \\
&= 2C_1(V)(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2k + \dim X - 2
\end{aligned}$$

Adding the dimension of gluing parameter, we derive Lemma 3.16. The general case can be proved inductively on the number of the components of Σ_f. We omit it.

This is the end of the construction of the extended equation. Next, we shall prove that

$$(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k), \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y,g,k), \bar{\partial}_J) \tag{3.70}$$

is VNA. The openness of $\mathcal{U}_S = \{(x,t); Coker D_{f,t}\mathcal{S}_e = \emptyset\}$ is a local property. To prove the second property, we first construct a local coordinate chart for each point of virtual neighborhood. Then, we prove that the local chart patches together to form a C^1-V-manifold. The construction of a local coordinate chart is basically a gluing theorem. The first gluing theorem for pseudo-holomorphic curve was given by [RT1]. There were two new proofs by [Liu], [MS] which are more suitable to the set-up we have here. Here we follow that of [MS]. For reader's convenience, we outline the proof here.

We need to enlarge our space to include Sobolev maps. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{M}_D(Y,g,k), t_0 \in \mathbf{R}^m$ such that $\mathcal{S}_e(f,t_0) = 0$ and $Coker\mathcal{D}_{f,t_0}\mathcal{S}_e = 0$. Choose metric λ on $\Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$. Using the trivialization of (3.18), we can define Sobolev norm on $\mathcal{U}_{f,D}$. Let

$$L^p_1(\mathcal{U}_{f,D}) = U_\Sigma \times \{f^w; w \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FY), ||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon, w \perp E_{e^f_i}\}. \tag{3.71}$$

By choosing small δ_0, we can assume that $D_{\delta_0}(e_i)$ is away from gluing region. For the rest of this section, we assume that $2 < p < 4$. Then, $L^p_1(\mathcal{U}_{f,D})$ is a Banach manifold. To simplify the notation, we shall assume that $dom(f) = \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2$ for the argument below. However, it is obvious that the same argument works for the general case. Let λ_v be the metric on Σ_v defined in (3.20). We use $L^p_v, L^p_{1,v}$ to denote the Sobolev norms on Σ_v, where v is used to indicate the dependence on v. By [MS] (Lemma A.3.1), the Sobolev constants of the metric λ_v are independent of v. Let

$$L^p_1(\mathcal{U}_f) = \bigcup_{\tilde{\Sigma}_v}\{f^{v,w}; w \in \Omega^0((f^v)^*T_FY), w \perp E_{e^f_i}, ||w||_{L^p_{1,v}} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i)))} < \epsilon\}. \tag{3.72}$$

First of all, the map

$$f^{w,v} : \mathcal{U}_{f,D} \times \mathbf{C}_f \to \mathcal{U}_f$$

induces a natural map

$$\phi_f : \Omega^0((f^w)^*T_FY) \to \Omega^0((f^{w,v})^*T_FY)$$

by the formula

(3.73)

$$u^{w,v} = \phi_f(u) = \begin{cases} u_1(x); x \in \Sigma_1 - D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ \bar{\beta}_r(t)(u_1(s,t)) - u_1(0)) + u_2(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}); x = re^{is} \in N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2}) \cong N_q(2r^2, \frac{2r^2}{\rho}) \\ u_1(s,t) + u_2(\theta + s, \frac{r^4}{t}) - u(0); x = re^{is} \in N_p(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2) \cong N_q(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2) \\ \bar{\beta}_r(t)(u_2(s,t)) - u_2(0)) + u_1(\theta + s, \frac{r^2}{t}); x = re^{is} \in N_q(\frac{r}{2}, r) \cong N_p(r, 2r) \\ u_2(x); x \in \Sigma_2 - D_q(2r) \end{cases}$$

where $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \Omega^0((f^w)^* T_F Y)$. Notes that $u_1(0) = u_2(0)$.

One can construct an inverse of ψ_f. For any $u \in \Omega^0((f^{w,v})^* T_F Y)$, we define

$$u_v = (u_v^1, u_v^2)$$

by

$$u_v^1 = \begin{cases} u(x); x \in \Sigma_1 - D_p(2r^2) \\ \tilde{\beta}_r(u(x) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2} \int_{S^1} u(s, r^2)) + \frac{1}{2\pi r^2} \int_{S^1} u(s, r^2); x \in D_p(2r^2) \end{cases} \tag{3.74}$$

$$u_v^2 = \begin{cases} u(x); x \in \Sigma_2 - D_q(2r^2) \\ \tilde{\beta}_r(u(x) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2} \int_{S^1} u(s, r^2)) + \frac{1}{2\pi r^2} \int_{S^1} u(s, r^2); x \in D_q(2r^2) \end{cases} \tag{3.75}$$

For any $\eta \in \Omega^{0,1}((f^{w,v})^* \mathcal{V}(Y))$, we cut η along the circle of radius r^2 and extend as zero inside the $D_p(r^2), D_q(r^2)$. We denote resulting 1-form as $\eta_1^f \in \Omega^{0,1}((f^w)^* \mathcal{V}(Y)), \eta_2^f \in \Omega^{0,1}(f^w)^* \mathcal{V}(Y))$. Clearly, (η_1^f, η_2^f) is an right inverse of $\eta^{w,v}$.

Lemma 3.17: *Let u be a 1-form over a disc of radius $\frac{2r^2}{\rho} < 1$. Then,*

$$|| \bigtriangledown \bar{\beta}_r(u - u(0))||_{L^p} \leq c|log\rho|^{1-\frac{4}{p}} ||u||_{L_1^p}. \tag{3.76}$$

The inequality is just the lemma A.1.2 of [MS], where we use r^2 instead of r.

Lemma 3.18: $||\phi_f(u^w)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq C||u^w||_{L^p_1}, ||u^i_v||_{L^p_1} \leq C||u||_{L^p_{1,v}}$.

Proof: We only have to consider u^w over $N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2})$, where

$$\phi_f(u_w) = \bar{\beta}_r(t)(u_1^w(s,t) - u_1^w(0)) + u_2^w(s + \theta, \frac{r^4}{t}). \tag{3.77}$$

$$||\phi_f(u^w)||_{L^p(N_p(\frac{\rho r2}{2},\frac{r2}{2}))} \leq C(||u_1^w||_{L_1^p(N_p(\frac{\rho r2}{2},\frac{r2}{2}))} + ||u_2^w||_{L_1^p(N_q(2r^2,\frac{2r2}{\rho}))} + |u_1^w(0)|) \tag{3.78}$$
$$\leq C(||u_1^w||_{L_1^p(N_p(\frac{\rho r2}{2},\frac{r2}{2}))} + ||u_2^w||_{L_1^p(N_q(2r^2,\frac{2r2}{\rho}))}).$$

(3.79)

$$|| \bigtriangledown \phi_f(u^w)||_{L^p(N_p(\frac{\rho r2}{2},\frac{r2}{2}))}$$
$$\leq C(|| \bigtriangledown u_1^w||_{L_1^p(N_p(\frac{\rho r2}{2},\frac{r2}{2}))} + || \bigtriangledown u_2^w||_{L_1^q(N_q(2r^2,\frac{2r2}{\rho}))} + || \bigtriangledown \bar{\beta}_r(u_1^w - u_1^w(0))||_{L^p(N_p(\frac{\rho r2}{2},\frac{r2}{2}))})$$
$$\leq C||u^w||_{L_1^p(N_p(\frac{r2}{4},\frac{r2}{2}))},$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 3.17. The proof of the second inequality is the same and we omit it. □

Proof of Proposition 3.11: Suppose that $f_n \to f$ as a weakly convergent sequence of holomorphic stable maps in the sense of [RT1]. Then, f_n converges to f in C^∞-norm in any compact domain outside the gluing region, in particular on $D_{\delta_0}(g(e_i))$. Now, we want to show that f_n is in the open set $\mathcal{U}_{f,D}$ for $n > N$. Note that formula (3.74,3.75) is a left inverse of formula (3.73). By Lemma 3.18, the formula (3.73) preserves L_1^p norm. Hence, it is enough to show that f_n is close to f^v when n is large. Namely, we want to estimate $||f_n - f^v||_{L_{1,v}^p}$. Outside of gluing region, f_n converges to f^v in the C^∞ norm. So $||(1-\beta)(f_n - f^v)||_{L_{1,v}^p}$ converges to zero, where β is a cut-off function vanishing outside gluing region. Over the gluing region, it is enough to show that $||\beta(f_n - pt)||_{L_1^p}$ is small where pt is the intersection point of two components of f. Here we assume that f has only two components to simplify the notation. The argument for general case is the same. By the decay estimate in [RT1](Lemma 6.10), $||f_n - pt||_{C^0}$ converges to zero over the gluing region with cylindric metric. However, C^0-norm is independent of the metric of domain. Hence, we have a C^0 estimate for the metric in this paper. Furthermore, f_n is holomopophic. By elliptic estimate,

$$||\beta(f_n-pt)|| \leq c(||\bar{\partial}_J(\beta(f_n-pt)||_{L_v^p}+||\beta(f_n-pt)||_{C^0} \leq c(||\bigtriangledown\beta(f_n-pt)||_{L_v^p}+||f_n-pt||_{C^0} \leq c||f_n-pt||_{C^0}.$$

We will finish the argument by showing that the constant in elliptic estimate is independent of the gluing parameter v. The later is easy since our metric is essentially equivalent to the metric on the anulus N(1,r) in R^2, where $r = |v|$ and $\beta(f_n - pt)$ is compact supported. □

Suppose that $D_{f,t_0}\mathcal{S}_e$ is surjective. Since $\mathcal{S}_e$ is smooth over $\mathcal{B}_D(Y,g,k)$, $D_{f^w,t}\mathcal{S}_e$ is surjective for $||w||_{L_1^p} < \delta, |t - t_0| < \delta$ with some small δ. We choose a family of right inverse $Q_{f^w,t}$. Then,

$$||Q_{f^w,t}|| \leq C. \tag{3.79.1}$$

We want to construct right inverse of $D_{f^{w,v},t}\mathcal{S}_e$.

Definition 3.19: *Define* $AQ_{f^{w,v},t}(\eta) = \phi_f Q_{f^w,t}(\eta_1^f, \eta_2^f)$.

Then, it was shown in [MS] that

Lemma 3.20:

$$||AQ_{f^{w,v},t}|| \leq C, ||D_{f^{w,v},t}AQ_{f^{w,v},t} - Id|| < \frac{1}{2} \text{ for small } r, \rho. \tag{3.80}$$

Now, we fix a ρ such that Lemma 3.20 holds.

The right inverse of $D_{f^{w,v},t}$ is given by

$$Q_{f^{w,v},t} = AQ_{f^{w,v},t}(D_{f^{w,v},t}AQ_{f^{w,v},t})^{-1}. \tag{3.81}$$

Furthermore,

$$||Q_{f^{w,v},t}|| \leq C. \tag{3.82}$$

Therefore, we show that

Corollary 3.21:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e} = \{(x,t); Coker D_{f,t}\mathcal{S}_e = \emptyset\}$$

is open.

Next, we have an estimate of error term.

Lemma 3.23: *Suppose that* $\mathcal{S}_e(f^w) = 0$. *Then,*

$$||\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})||_{L^p_v} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}. \tag{3.83}$$

Proof: It is clear that $\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w}) = 0$ away from the gluing region. Notes that the value of s_{f_i} is supported away from the gluing region. Hence, $\mathcal{S}_e = \bar{\partial}_J$ over the gluing region. Then, the lemma follows from [MS] (Lemma A.4.3). □

Next we construct the coordinate charts of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e}$. Suppose that $(f, t_0) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e}$. By the previous argument, we can assume that some neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_f \times B_\delta(t_0) \subset \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e}$. To simplify the notation, we drop t-component. It is understood that s_{f_i} will not affect the argument since it's value is supported away from the gluing region. Since $L_1^p(\mathcal{U}_{f,D})$ is a Banach manifold and the restriction to $\mathcal{S}_e$ is a Fredholm map, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k)$ is a smooth V-manifold by ordinary transversality theorem. Let

$$f \in E_f^D \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{B}_D(Y, g, k) \tag{3.84}$$

be a small stb_f-invariant neighborhood.

Theorem 3.24: *There is a one-to-one continuous map*

$$\alpha_f : E_f^D \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_f) \to \mathcal{U}_f \tag{3.85}$$

such that $im(\alpha_f)$ is an open neighborhood of $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e}$, where δ_f is a small constant.

Proof: For any $w \in E_f^D$ and small v, we would like to find an element $\xi(w, v) \in \Omega^0((f^v)^* T_F Y)$ with $\xi \perp E_{e_i}$ and $\xi(w, v) \in ImQ_{f^{w,v}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}_e((f^{v,w})^{\xi(w,v)}) = 0. \tag{3.86}$$

Consider the Taylor expansion

$$\mathcal{S}_e((f^{v,w})^{\xi}) = \mathcal{S}(f^{w,v}) + D_{f^{w,v}}(\xi) + N_{f^{w,v}}(\xi),$$

for $w \in E_f^D, \xi \in \Omega^0((f^v)^* T_F Y)$ with $\xi(e_i^v) \perp df(e_i^v), ||w||_{L_{1,v}^p}, ||\xi||_{L_{1,v}^p} < \epsilon$. Then,

$$\xi(w, v) = -Q_{f^{w,v}}(S(f^{w,v}) + N_{f^{w,v}}(\xi(w, v)). \tag{3.87}$$

Hence, $\xi(w, v)$ is a fixed point of the map

$$H(w, v; \xi) = -Q_{f^{w,v}}(S(f^{w,v}) + N_{f^{w,v}}(\xi)). \tag{3.88}$$

Conversely, if $\xi(w, v)$ is a fixed point,

$$\mathcal{S}_e((f^{v,w})^{\xi(w,v)}) = 0. \tag{3.89}$$

$N_{f^{w,v}}$ satisfies the condition

$$||N_{f^{w,v}}(\eta_1) - N_{f^{w,v}}(\eta_2)||_{L_v^p} \leq C(||\eta_1||_{L_{1,v}^p} + ||\eta_2||_{L_{1,v}^p})||\eta_1 - \eta_2||_{L_{1,v}^p}. \tag{3.90}$$

Next, we show that H is a contraction map on a ball of radius $\delta/4$ for some δ.

$$||H(w, v; \xi)||_{L_{1,v}^p} \leq C(||\mathcal{S}_e(f^{w,v})||_{L_v^p} + ||N_{f^{w,v}}(\xi)||_{L_v^p})$$

$$\leq C(r^{\frac{4}{p}} + ||\xi||^2_{L^p_{1,v}}) \leq \frac{\delta}{4}, \tag{3.91}$$

for $||\xi||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ and $2C\delta < 1, r < (\frac{\delta^2}{4})^{-\frac{4}{p}}$.

$$||H(w, v; \xi) - H(w, v; \eta)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq C||N_{f^{w,v}}(\xi) - N_{f^{w,v}}(\eta)||_{L^p_v}$$

$$\leq C(||\xi||_{L^p_{1,v}} + ||\eta||_{L^p_{1,v}})||\xi - \eta||_{L^p_{1,v}} < 2\delta C||\xi - \eta||_{L^p_{1,v}}. \tag{3.92}$$

Therefore, H is a contraction map on the ball of radius $\frac{\delta}{4}$. Then, there is a unique fixed point $\xi(w, v)$. Furthermore, $\xi(w, v)$ depends smoothly on w. Recall that $\xi(w, v)$ is obtained by iterating H. One can check that

$$||\xi(w, v)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}. \tag{3.93}$$

Our coordinate chart at f is $(E^D_f \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_f), \alpha_f(v, w))$ where $\delta_f = (\frac{\delta^2}{4})^{\frac{4}{p}}$. and

$$\alpha_f(v, w) = (f^{v,w})^{\xi(w,v)}. \tag{3.94}$$

Notes that all the construction is stb_f-invariant. Hence α_f is stb_f-invariant. It is clear that α_f is one-to-one by contraction mapping principal. Notes that $\mathcal{S}_e = \bar{\partial}_J$ over the gluing region. It follows from Proposition 3.11 and uniqueness of contraction mapping principal that α_f is surjective onto a neighborhood of f in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e}$. □

Furthermore, $E^D_f \times \mathbf{C}_f$ has a natural orientation induced by the orientation of J, $\mathbf{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{C}_f$.

Next, we show that the transition map is a C^1-orientation preserving map. In the previous argument, we expand $\mathcal{S}_e$ up to the second order, which is given in [F], [MS]. To prove the transition map is C^1, we need to expand $\mathcal{S}_e$ up to third order. Let $z = s + it$ be the complex coordinate of Σ_v. Let $\bigtriangledown^v \xi = \bigtriangledown_t \xi + \bigtriangledown_s \xi$ to indicate the dependence on v. Let

$$f^{w,v} = exp_{f^v} w^v. \tag{3.95}$$

Let $\xi \in L^p_{1,v}(\Omega^0((f^v)^* T_F Y))$ with $||w^v||_{L^p_{1,v}}, ||\xi||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq \delta$ for small δ. A similar calculation of [MS] (Theorem 3.3.4) implies

$$\bar{\partial}_J(f^v)^{w^v+\xi}) = \bar{\partial}_J(f^{v,w}) + D_{f^{v,w}}(\xi) + D^2_{f^{v,w}}(\xi^2) + \tilde{N}_{f^{v,w}}(\xi), \tag{3.96}$$

where

$$D_{f^{w,v}}(\xi) = \bigtriangledown^v_s \xi + J \bigtriangledown^v_t \xi + (C_1 \bigtriangledown w^v + C_2 \bigtriangledown^v f^v + C_2 \bigtriangledown^v w)\xi, \tag{3.97}$$

$$D^2_{f^{w,v}}\xi = (C_1 \bigtriangledown^v f^v + C_2 \bigtriangledown^v w^v)\xi^2 + C_3\xi \bigtriangledown^v \xi, \tag{3.98}$$

$$\tilde{N}_{f^{w,v}}(\xi) = (C_1 \bigtriangledown^v f^v + C_2 \bigtriangledown^v w^v)\xi^3 + C_3(\bigtriangledown^v \xi)\xi^2, \tag{3.99}$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3 are smooth bounded functions for each of the identities. Furthermore, we have

$$D_{(f^v)^{w^v+\tilde{w}}}(\xi) = D_{f^{w,v}}\xi + (2C_1 \bigtriangledown^v f^v + 2C_2 \bigtriangledown^v w^v)\tilde{w}\xi + C_3\tilde{w} \bigtriangledown^v \xi + C_4\tilde{w} \bigtriangledown \xi + O(\tilde{w}^2), \tag{3.100}$$

where the coefficients of higher order terms are independent from $\tilde{w}$ by (3.99).

Lemma 3.25: *The derivative with respect to* w

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial w} D_{f^{v,w}}(\tilde{w})(\xi)||_{L^p_v} \leq C(||f^v||_{L^p_{1,v}} + ||w^v||_{L^p_{1,v}})||\tilde{w}||_{L^p_{1,v}}||\xi||_{L^p_{1,v}}. \tag{3.101}$$

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial w} N_{f^{v,w}}(\tilde{w})(\xi)||_{L^p_v} \leq C(||f^v||_{L^p_{1,v}} + ||w^v||_{L^p_{1,v}})||\tilde{w}||_{L^p_{1,v}}||\xi||^2_{L^p_{1,v}}. \tag{3.102}$$

Proof: The first inequality follows from 3.100. To prove the second inequality, recall that

$$N_{f^{v,w}}(\xi) = \mathcal{S}_e((f^v)^{w^v+\xi}) - \mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w}) - D_{f^{v,w}}(\xi). \tag{3.103}$$

Hence

$$\begin{array}{rl} & N_{(f^v)^{w^v+\tilde{w}}}(\xi) - N_{f^{v,w}}(\xi) \\ = & \mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w^v+\tilde{w}+\xi}) - \mathcal{S}_e((f^v)^{w^v+\xi}) - (\mathcal{S}_e((f^v)^{w^v+\tilde{w}}) - \mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})) - (D_{(f^v)^{w^v+\tilde{w}}}(\xi) - D_{f^{v,w}}(\xi)) \\ = & D_{(f^v)^{w^v+\xi}}(\tilde{w}) - D_{f^{v,w}}(\tilde{w}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial w} D_{f^{v,w}}(\tilde{w})(\xi) + O(\tilde{w}^2) \\ = & \frac{\partial}{\partial w} D_{f^{v,w}}(\xi)(\tilde{w}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial w} D_{f^{v,w}}(\tilde{w})(\xi) + O(\tilde{w}^2) \end{array}. \tag{3.104}$$

Therefore, the second inequality follows from the first one.

Next, we consider the derivative of D, N with respect to the v. First of all,

Lemma 3.26: *Let* $|v - v_0| < \delta$ *for small* δ *and* j_v *be the complex structure on* Σ_v*, there is a smooth family of diffeomorphism* $\Phi_v : \Sigma_{v_0} \to \Sigma_v$ *such that* $\Phi_v = id$ *outside gluing region and*

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}(\Phi_v j_v(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}))| \leq \frac{C}{r_0}. \tag{3.105}$$

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}(\Phi_v j_v(\frac{\partial}{\partial s}))| \leq \frac{C}{r_0}. \tag{3.106}$$

Proof: The complex structure outside the gluing region does not change. Over the gluing region, it is conformal equivalent to a cylinder. Constructing Φ_v in the cylindric model, we will obtain the estimate of Lemma 3.26.□

Suppose that we want to estimate the derivative at v_0. We fix $u = f^{v_0}$ and the trivialization given by Φ_v. To abuse the notation, let $f^{v,w} = exp_{f^{v_0}} w^v$. We still have the same Taylor expansion (3.96)-(3.100). Furthermore, we can estimate $\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} \bigtriangledown^v \xi$ by the norms of $\bigtriangledown^{v_0}\xi$ and the derivative of Φ_v. Hence,

Corollary 3.27: *Under the same condition of Lemma 3.26,*

$$(3.107) \qquad ||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} D_{f^{v,w}}(\xi)||_{L^p_v} \leq \frac{C}{|v_0|}(||f^{v_0}||_{L^p_{1,v}} + ||w^{v_0}||_{L^p_{1,v}})||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} w^v||_{L^p_{1,v}} ||\xi||_{L^p_{1,v}}.$$

$$(3.108) \qquad ||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} N_{f^{v,w}}(\xi)||_{L^p_v} \leq \frac{C}{|v_0|}(||f^{v_0}||_{L^p_{1,v}} + ||w^{v_0}||_{L^p_{1,v}})||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} w^v||_{L^p_{1,v}} ||\xi||^2_{L^p_{1,v}}.$$

Next, we compute the derivative of $Q_{f^{v,w}}$. Recall that

$$(3.109) \qquad Q_{f^{v,w}} = AQ_{f^{v,w}}(D_{f^{v,w}}Q_{f^{v,w}})^{-1}.$$

Therefore, it is enough to compute $AQ_{f^{v,w}} = \phi_f Q_{f^w}$ and $((D_{f^{v,w}}Q_{f^{v,w}})^{-1})'$. Clearly,

$$(3.110) \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial w} AQ_{f^{w,v}} = \phi_f(\frac{\partial}{\partial w} Q_{f^w}).$$

$$(3.111) \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial v} AQ_{f^{w,v}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v}(\phi_f)Q_{f^w}.$$

Recall that in the gluing construction, only the cut-off function has variable v. Hence, we need to compute the derivative of the cut-off function with respect to v.

Lemma 3.28:

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\bar{\beta}_r| < \frac{C}{r}.$$

Proof:

$$\bar{\beta}_r(t) = \int_{\frac{r^2\rho}{2}}^{\frac{r^2}{2}} (1 - \frac{log(u) - log(r^2)}{-log\rho}) T(t-u)du + \int_{\frac{r^2}{2}}^{\infty} T(t-u)du.$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\bar{\beta}_r(t) = \int \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\frac{log(u) - log(r^2)}{-log\rho}T(t-u)du + (1 - \frac{log(\frac{r^2}{2}) - log(r^2)}{-log\rho})T(t - \frac{r^2}{2})r$$

$$+(1 - \frac{log(\frac{r^2\rho}{2}) - log(r^2)}{-log\rho})T(t - \frac{r^2\rho}{2})r\rho + T(t - \frac{r^2}{2})r, \tag{3.112}$$

where $T(t-u)$ is a positive smooth function with compact supported and integral 1. Then,

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\bar{\beta}_r| < \frac{C}{r}. \tag{3.113}$$

□

Furthermore, we can choose Q_{f^w} such that $\frac{\partial}{\partial w}Q_{f^w}$ is bounded. Therefore,

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial w}AQ_{f^{w,v}}|| < C. \tag{3.114}$$

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}AQ_{f^{w,v}}|| < \frac{C}{|v_0|}. \tag{3.115}$$

Notes that

$$D_{f^{w,v}}AQ_{f^{v,w}}(D_{f^{w,v}}AQ_{f^{v,w}})^{-1} = Id. \tag{3.116}$$

Hence,

$$((D_{f^{w,v}}AQ_{f^{v,w}})^{-1})' = -(D_{f^{w,v}}AQ_{f^{v,w}})^{-1}(D_{f^{w,v}}AQ_{f^{v,w}})'(D_{f^{w,v}}AQ_{f^{v,w}})^{-1}. \tag{3.117}$$

Combined (3.114)-(3.117), we obtain

Lemma 3.29:

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial w}Q_{f^{v,w}}|| \leq C. \tag{3.118}$$

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}Q_{f^{v,w}}|| \leq \frac{C}{|v_0|}. \tag{3.119}$$

Next, let's compute the derivative of $\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})$. Let $w_\mu \in E_f^D$ be a smooth path such that $w_0 = w$ and $\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}w_\mu = \tilde{w}$.

Lemma 3.30: *For $w \in E_f^D$, we view $\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})$ as a map from $E_f^D \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_f)$ to $\mathcal{U}_f$ where we use local trivialization given by Φ_v in Lemma 3.26. Then,*

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w_\mu})||_{L^p_v} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}, \tag{3.120}$$

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})||_{L^p_{v_0}} \leq Cr_0^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag{3.121}$$

Proof: $\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w_\mu}) = 0$ outside the gluing region and over $N_p(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2)$. Therefore, the derivative is zero outside the gluing region and over $N_p(\frac{r^2}{2}, 2r^2)$. Here, we work over a slightly larger domain $N_p(\frac{\rho r_0^2}{2.1}, \frac{(2.1)r_0^2}{\rho})$ so that we can vary r in a fixed domain.

It is enough to work over $N_p(\frac{\rho r_0^2}{2.1}, \frac{r_0^2}{2})$, where

$$f^{v,w_\mu} = \bar{\beta}_r(t)(f_1^{w_\mu}(s,t)) - f_1^{w_\mu}(s,0)) + f_2^{w_\mu}(s+\theta, \frac{r^4}{t}). \tag{3.124}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w_\mu}) = \bigtriangledown\bar{\beta}_r(t)(f_1^{w_\mu}(s,t)) - f_1^{w_\mu}(s,0)). \tag{3.125}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w_\mu}) = \bigtriangledown\bar{\beta}_r(t)(\tilde{w}_1(s,t) - \tilde{w}_1(s,0)). \tag{3.126}$$

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w_\mu})||_{L^p_v} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{C^1}. \tag{3.127}$$

Since $\tilde{w}$ varies in a finite dimensional space and $\tilde{w}$ is smooth, we can replace C^1 norm by L^p_1-norm. Hence,

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w_\mu})||_{L^p_v} \leq Cr^{\frac{2}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{L^p_1}. \tag{3.128}$$

When we pull it back to the Σ_{v_0} by $\Phi_v = (\Phi_v^1, \Phi_v^2)$,

$$\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w}) = \bigtriangledown\bar{\beta}_r(\Phi_v^2(s,t))(f^w(\Phi_v(t,s)) - f_1^w(\Phi_v^1(t,s),0)). \tag{3.129}$$

Using Lemma 3.26 and Lemma 3.28, it is easy to estimate that

$$|\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})| \leq C\frac{1}{r_0}||f^w||_{C^1}. \tag{3.130}$$

Hence,

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})||_{L^p_{v_0}} \leq C\frac{1}{r_0}vol(N_p(\frac{\rho r_0^2}{2}, \frac{r_0^2}{2}))^{\frac{1}{p}}||f^w||_{C^1} \leq Cr_0^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag{3.131}$$

Here, we use the fact that f^w is smooth and varies in a finite dimension set E_f^D with bounded L_1^p norm. □.

The same analysis will also implies that

Lemma 3.31:

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} f^{v,w}||_{L^p_{1,v_0}} \leq C||w||_{L^p_1} \tag{3.132}$$

for $f^w \in E^D_f$*.*

We leave it to readers to fill out the detail. Let F be the inverse of $exp_{f^{v_0}}$. Then,

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} w^v|| \leq C(F)||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0} f^{v,w}||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq C(F)||w||_{L^p_1}. \tag{3.133}$$

Putting all the estimate together, we obtain

Proposition 3.32:

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\xi(v,w_\mu)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag{3.134}$$

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}\xi(v,w)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq Cr_0^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag{3.135}$$

Proof: Recall that

$$\xi(v,w) = H(v,w,\xi(v,w)) = -Q_{f^{v,w}}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w}) - Q_{f^{v,w}}N_{f^{v,w}}(\xi(v,w)). \tag{3.136}$$

By Lemma 3.25-3.32, we have bound derivatives for all the term of H. Moreover, the derivative of error term $\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w})$ is of the order $r^{\frac{4}{p}}$. Recall $\xi(v,w)$ is obtained by iterating H. Hence, the derivative of $\xi(v,w)$ is bounded by δ in (3.91) when r is small.

(3.137)

$$\xi'(v,w) = Q'_{f^{v,w}}\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w}) - Q_{f^{v,w}}\mathcal{S}'_e(f^{v,w}) - (Q'_{f^{v,w}}N_{f^{v,w}} + Q_{f^{v,w}}N'_{f^{v,w}})(\xi(v,w)) - Q_{f^{v,w}}N_{f^{v,w}}(\xi'(v,w)).$$

By Lemma 3.25-3.32 and formula 3.133,

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\xi(v,w_\mu)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq C_1 r^{\frac{4}{p}-1} + C_2||\xi(v,w)||_{L^p_{1,v}} + C_3||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\xi(v,w_\mu)||^2_{L^p_{1,v}}. \tag{3.138}$$

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}\xi(v,w_\mu)||_{L^p_{1,v}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\delta C_3}(C_1 r^{\frac{4}{p}-1} + C_2||\xi(v,w)||_{L^p_{1,v}}). \tag{3.139}$$

Using (3.93), we obtain the inequality (3.134). The proof of the second inequality (3.135) is completely same. Only difference is that the derivative of $Q_{f^{w,v}}, N_{f^{v,w}}$ has a order $\frac{1}{r_0}$. However, we have $\mathcal{S}_e(f^{v,w}), \xi(v,w)$ in the formula, where both have order $r_0^{\frac{4}{p}}$. Hence, we obtain the order $r_0^{\frac{4}{p}-1}$.

□

Let u be a map over Σ_v and $\xi \in \Omega^0(f^*T_FV)$. We define $u_v = (u_v^1, u_v^2)$ and $\xi_v = (\xi_v^1, \xi_v^2)$ as in (3.36), (3.73). Now, we want to embed $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{U}_f$ into $\mathcal{U}_{f,D} \times \mathbf{C}_f$ by the map

$$exp_u\xi \to (exp_{u_v}\xi_v, v) \tag{3.140}$$

for u over Σ_v. Consider the composition of (3.140) with $\alpha_{v,w}$.

$$\alpha(v,w)_v : E_f^D \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_f) \to L_1^p(\mathcal{U}_{f,D}) \times \mathbf{C}_f. \tag{3.141}$$

Proposition 3.33: *$\alpha(v,w)_v$ is C^1-smooth.*

Proof: Our proof is motivated by the following observation. Suppose that f is a continuous function over $\mathbf{R}$ such that $f(0) = 0$ and f is C^1 for $x \neq 0$. If $|f'(x)| \leq Cx^\alpha$ for $\alpha > 0$, by mean value theorem $f'(0) = 0$ and f' is continuous at $x = 0$.

We first prove

$$(f^w, v) \to f_v^{v,w} \tag{3.142}$$

is a C^1-map. $f_v^{v,w} = f^w$ outside the gluing region. By symmetry, it is enough to consider $D_p(\frac{2r^2}{\rho})$. Over $D_p(2r^2)$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f_v^{v,w} & = & \tilde{\beta}_r(f_1^w(s,t) + f_2^w(s,t) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1}(f_1^w(s,r^2) + f_2^w(\theta + s, r^2))) \\ & & + \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1}(f_1^w(s,r^2) + f_2^w(\theta + s, r^2)) \end{array}. \tag{3.143}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}(f_v^{v,w_\mu} - f^{w_\mu}) & = & \tilde{\beta}_r(\tilde{w}_1(s,t) + \tilde{w}_2(s,t) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1}(\tilde{w}_1(s,r^2) + \tilde{w}_2(\theta + s, r^2))) \\ & & + \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1}(\tilde{w}_1(s,r^2) + \tilde{w}_2(\theta + s, r^2)) \end{array}. \tag{3.144}$$

Note that

$$|\frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1} \tilde{w}(s,r^2) - \tilde{w}(s,0)| \leq Cr^2||\tilde{w}||_{C^1}. \tag{3.145.}$$

By inserting the term $\tilde{w}(s,0)$ in the formula (3.144),

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}(f^{v,w_\mu} - f^{w_\mu})||_{L^p(D_p(2r^2)} \leq Cvol(D_p(2r^2))^{\frac{1}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{C^1} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{L_1^p}. \tag{3.146}$$

Here, we use the fact that $\tilde{w}$ varies in a finite dimensional space.

$$\begin{array}{rl} & || \bigtriangledown \frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}(f^{v,w_\mu} - f^{w_\mu})||_{L^p(D_p(2r^2)} \\ \leq & || \bigtriangledown \tilde{\beta}_r(\tilde{w}_1(s,t) + \tilde{w}_2(s,t) - \frac{1}{2\pi r^2}\int_{S^1}(\tilde{w}_1(s,r^2) + \tilde{w}_2(\theta+s,r^2))||_{L^p} \\ & +||\tilde{\beta}_r \bigtriangledown (\tilde{w}_1 + \tilde{w}_2)||_{L^p(D_p(2r^2)} \\ \leq & C(vol(D_p(2r^2)))^{\frac{1}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{C^1} \\ \leq & Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{L^p_1} \end{array} . \tag{3.147}$$

Over $N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2}, \frac{r^2}{2})$,

$$f_v^{v,w} = f_2^w(s,t) + \bar{\beta}_r(f_1^w(s+\theta,t) - f_1^w(0)). \tag{3.147.1}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}(f_v^{v,w_\mu} - f^{w_\mu}) = \bar{\beta}_r(\tilde{w}_2(s,t) - \tilde{w}_2(0)). \tag{3.147.2}$$

The same argument shows that

$$||\frac{d}{d\mu}|_{\mu=0}(f_v^{v,w_\mu} - f^{w_\mu})||_{L^p_1(N_p(\frac{\rho r^2}{2},\frac{r^2}{2}))} \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}}||\tilde{w}||_{L^p_1}. \tag{3.147.3}$$

Using previous argument and Lemma 3.26, we can also show that

$$||\frac{\partial}{\partial v}|_{v=v_0}(f_v^{v,w} - f^w)||_{L^p_1} \leq Cr_0^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag{3.148}$$

Therefore,

$$||(f_v^{v,w})' - (f^w)'|| \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag*{(3.149).}$$

$f_v^{v,w}$ is C^1 for $v \neq 0$. At $v = 0$, the estimate (3.149) implies

$$(f_v^{v,w})' = (f^w)' \text{ at } v = 0. \tag{3.150}$$

Moreover, $(f_v^{v,w})'$ is continuous. The same argument together with Proposition 3.32 shows that

$$||(\xi(v,w)_v)'|| \leq Cr^{\frac{4}{p}-1}. \tag{3.151}$$

Hence, $\xi(v,w)_v$ is a C^1-map and has derivative zero at $v = 0$. In general,

$$(exp_{f_v^{v,w}}\xi(v,w)_v)' = D_1 exp_{f_v^{v,w}}\xi(v,w)_v(f_v^{v,w})' + D_2 exp_{f_v^{v,w}}\xi(v,w)_v(\xi(v,w)_v)', \tag{3.152}$$

where D_1, D_2 are the partial derivatives of exp-function.

$$\begin{array}{rl} & ||(exp_{f_v^{v,w}}\xi(v,w)_v)' - (f^w)'|| \\ \leq & ||D_1 exp_{f_v^{v,w}}\xi(v,w)_v(f_v^{v,w})' - (D_1 exp_{f_v^{v,w}}0)(f_v^{v,w})'|| \\ & +||(f_v^{v,w})' - (f^w)'|| + ||D_2 exp_{f_v^{v,w}}\xi(v,w)_v(\xi(v,w)_v)'|| \\ \leq & C||\xi(v,w)_v||_{L^\infty}||(f_v^{v,w})'|| + Cr^{\frac{4}{p}-1} \\ \leq & C||\xi(v,w)_v||_{L_1^p}||(f^w)'|| + Cr^{\frac{4}{p}-1} \\ \leq & Cr^{\frac{4}{p}-1} \end{array}. \tag{3.153}$$

Notes that $\alpha(v,w)_v$ is identity on $\mathbf{C}_f$-factor. Hence, we prove the proposition. Moreover, the derivative of $\alpha(v,w)_v$ is identity at $v = 0$, since $\frac{\partial}{\partial w} f^w = id$. □

Theorem 3.34: *With the coordinate system given by* $(E_f^D \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_f), \alpha_f(v,w))$, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_e}$ *is a* C^1*-oriented V-manifold.*

Proof: Recall the definition 2.1. Suppose that $\alpha_{\bar{f}}(E_{\bar{f}}^{\bar{D}} \times B_{\delta_{\bar{f}}}(\mathbf{C}_{\bar{f}})) \subset \alpha_f(E_f^D \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_f))$. Then, $stb_{\bar{f}} \subset stb_f$ and we can assume that $E_{\bar{f}}^{\bar{D}} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\bar{f}} \subset \mathcal{U}_f$. It is clear that $\bar{D}$ is either a higher strata than D or D. Let's consider the case that $\bar{D}$ is a higher strata. The proof for the second case is the same. To be more precise, let's consider the case that D has three components $\Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2 \wedge \Sigma_3$ and $\bar{D}$ has two components $\Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2 \#_{v_2} \Sigma_3$ for $v_2 \neq 0$. The general case is similar and we leave it to readers. Suppose that the gluing parameters are $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{C}_1 \times \mathbf{C}_2$. To construct Banach manifold $L_1^p(\mathcal{U}_{\bar{f}})$, we need a trivialization of $\bigcup_{v_2} \Sigma_2 \#_{v_2} \Sigma_3$. As we discuss in the beginning of this section, we can choose any trivialization. Here, we choose the one given by Φ_{v_2} Lemma 3.26. Clearly, $\alpha_f(v,w)$ maps an open subset of $E_f^D \times B_{\delta_f}(\mathbf{C}_2)$ onto $E_{\bar{f}}^{\bar{D}}$ as a diffeomorphism. Now, we embed $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\bar{f}}$ into $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{D}}$ by (3.140). By Proposition 3.33, both

$$\alpha_f(v,w)_{v_1}, \alpha_{\bar{f}}(v_1,w)_{v_1} \tag{3.154}$$

are injective C^1-map. Hence, we can view the image of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_e} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\bar{f}}$ as a C^1-submanifold of $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{D}} \times \mathbf{C}_{\bar{f}}$ and both $\alpha_f(v,w)_{v_1}, \alpha_{\bar{f}}(v_1,w)_{v_1}$ as C^1-diffeomorphisms to this submanifold. Hence,

$$(\alpha_f(v,w))^{-1}\alpha_{\bar{f}}(v_1,w) = (\alpha_f(v,w)_{v_1})^{-1}\alpha_{\bar{f}}(v_1,w)_{v_1}. \tag{3.155}$$

is a C^1-diffeomorphism.

Next, we consider the orientation. First of all, it was proved in [RT1] (Theorem 6.1) that both $\alpha_f(v,w)$ and $\alpha_{\bar{f}}(v_1,w)$ are orientation preserving diffeomorphism when $v_1 \neq 0, v_2 \neq 0$. Therefore, it is enough to consider the case $v_1 = 0$. By our argument in Proposition 3.33 (3.150, 3.151),

$$(\alpha_f(v,w)_{v_1})'|_{v_1=0} = (\alpha_f(v_2,w))'|_{v_1=0} \times id_{C_1},\ (\alpha_{\bar{f}}(v_1,w))'|_{v_1=0} = id. \tag{3.157}$$

Moreover, $\alpha_f(v_2, w)$ is an orientation preserving diffeomorphism. Hence, the transition map is an orientation preserving diffeomorphism. We finish the proof. $\Box$.

4 GW-invariants of a family of symplectic manifolds

In this section, we shall give a detail construction of GW-invariants for a family of symplectic manifolds. Furthermore, we will prove composition law and k-reduction formula. Let's recall the construction in the introduction.

Let

$$p : Y \to M \tag{4.1}$$

be an oriented fiber bundle such that the fiber X and the base M are smooth, compact, oriented manifolds. Then, Y is also a smooth, compact, oriented manifold. Let ω be a closed 2-form on Y such that ω restricts to a symplectic form over each fiber. Hence, we can view Y as a family of symplectic manifolds. A ω-tamed almost complex structure J is an automorphism of the vertical tangent bundle $V(Y)$ such that $J^2 = -Id$ and $\omega(w, Jw) > 0$ for any vertical tangent vector $w \neq 0$. Suppose $A \in H_2(V, \mathbf{Z}) \subset H_2(Y, \mathbf{Z})$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{g,k}$ be the moduli space of genus g Riemann surfaces with k-marked points such that $2g + k > 2$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ be its Deligne-Mumford compactification. We shall use

$$f : \Sigma \xrightarrow{F} Y$$

to indicate that the $im(f)$ is contained in a fiber. Consider its compactification- the moduli space of stable holomorphic maps $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$.

Using the machinery of section 2 and 3, we can define a virtual neighborhood invariant $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}$. Here, we have to specify the cohomology class α in the definition of virtual neighborhood invariant $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}$. Recall that we have two natural maps

$$\Xi_{g,k} : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \to Y^k \tag{4.2}$$

defined by evaluating f at marked points and

$$\chi_{g,k} : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \tag{4.3}$$

defined by forgetting the map and contracting the unstable components of the domain. Notes that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ is a V-manifold. Suppose $K \in H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}, \mathbf{R})$ and $\alpha_i \in H^*(V, \mathbf{R})$ are represented by differential forms.

Definition 4.1: *We define*

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)=\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\chi^*_{g,k}(K)\wedge\Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i\alpha_i)). \tag{4.4}$$

Theorem 4.2 *(i).*$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)$ *is well-defined, multi-linear and skew symmetry.*

(ii). $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)$ *is independent of the choice of forms* K,α_i *representing the cohomology classes* $[K],[\alpha_i]$*, and the choice of virtual neighborhoods.*

(iii). $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)$ *is independent of* J *and is a symplectic deformation invariant.*

(iv). When $Y=V$ *is semi-positive and some multiple of* $[K]$ *is represented by an immersed V-submanifold,* $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)$ *agrees with the definition of [RT2].*

Proof: (i) follows from the definition and we omit it. (ii) follows from Proposition 2.7.

To prove (iii), suppose that ω_t is a family of symplectic structures and J_t is a family of almost complex structures such that J_t is tamed with ω_t. Then, we can construct a weakly smooth Banach cobordism $(\mathcal{B}_{(t)},\mathcal{F}_{(t)},\mathcal{S}_{(t)})$ of

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y,g,k,J_{(t)})=\cup_{t\in[0,1]}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y,g,k,J_t)\times\{t\}. \tag{4.5}$$

Then, (iii) follows from Proposition 2.8 and section 3.

To prove (iv), recall the construction of [RT2]. To avoid the confusion, we will use Φ to denote the invariant defined in [RT2]. The construction of [RT1] starts from an inhomogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equation. It was known that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ does not admit a universal family, which causes a problem to define inhomogeneous term. To overcome this difficulty, Tian and the author choose a finite cover

$$p_\mu:\overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_{g,k}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}. \tag{4.6}$$

such that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_{g,k}$ admits a universal family. One can use the universal family of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_{g,k}$ to define an inhomogeneous term ν and inhomogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equation $\bar\partial_J f=\nu$. Any f satisfying this equation is called *a* (J,ν)*-map.* Choose a generic (J,ν) such that the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^\mu_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$ of (J,ν)-map is smooth and the certain contraction $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^r_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$ is of codimension 2 boundary. Define

$$\Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}:\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)\to X^k$$

and

$$\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu, g, k, J, \nu) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu}_{g,k}$$

similarly. Then, we can choose Poincare duals (as pseudo-submanifolds) K^*, α^* of K, α_i such that K^*, α^* did not meet the image of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu, g, k, J, \nu) - \mathcal{M}_A(\mu, g, k, J, \nu)$ under the map $\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}$ and intersects transversely to the restriction of $\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}$ to $\mathcal{M}_A(\mu, g, k, J, \nu)$. Once this is done, $\Phi^X_{(A,g,k,\mu)}$ is defined as the number of the points of $(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha_i^*)$, counted by the orientation. Then, we define

$$\Phi^V_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\mu}_{g,k}} \Phi^V_{(A,g,k,\mu)}(p^*_{\mu}(K); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k),$$

where $\lambda^{\mu}_{g,k}$ is the order of cover map p_{μ} (4.6).

The proof of (iv) is divided into 3-steps. First we observe that we can replace $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu}_{g,k}$ in our construction. Let $\pi_{\mu} : \overline{\mathcal{B}}^{\mu}_{g,k}$ be the projection and $(\mathcal{E}_{g,k}, s_{g,k})$ be the stablization terms for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$. Then, we can choose $(\pi^*_{\mu}\mathcal{E}_{g,k}, \pi^*_{\mu} s_{g,k})$ to be the stablization term of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu}_{g,k}$. Suppose that the resulting finite dimensional virtual neighborhoods are $(U, E, S), (U^{\mu}, E^{\mu}, S^{\mu})$ and invariant are $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}, \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k,\mu)}$, respectively. Then, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} U^{\mu} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & E^{\mu} \arrow[d] \\ U \arrow[r] & E \end{tikzcd} \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd} U^{\mu} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & V^k \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu}_{g,k} \arrow[d] \\ U \arrow[r] & V^k \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \end{tikzcd} . \tag{4.8}$$

Let λ be the order of the cover $p_U : U^{\mu} \to U$ and λ' be the order of the cover $p_G : E^{\mu} \to E$. One can check that

$$\lambda = \lambda' \lambda^{\mu}_{g,k}. \tag{4.9}$$

Let Θ be a Thom-form supported in a neighborhood of zero section of E. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^V_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) &= \textstyle\int_U \chi^*_{g,k}(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*(\Theta) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{\lambda} \textstyle\int_{U^{\mu}} (\chi^{\mu}_{g,k})^*(p^*_{\mu}(K)) \wedge (\Xi^{\mu}_{g,k})^*(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge (p_U S)^*(\Theta) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{\lambda^{\mu}_{g,k}} \textstyle\int_{U^{\mu}} (\chi^{\mu}_{g,k})^*(p^*_{\mu}(K)) \wedge (\Xi^{\mu}_{g,k})^*(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge (S^{\mu})^*(\tfrac{1}{\lambda'} p^*_G(\Theta)) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{\lambda^{\mu}_{g,k}} \Psi^V_{(A,g,k,\mu)}(p^*_{\mu}(K); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where $\frac{1}{\lambda'}p_G^*(\Theta)$ is a Thom form of E^μ. Therefore, it is enough to show that

$$\Psi^V_{(A,g,k,\mu)} = \Phi^V_{(A,g,k,\mu)}.$$

The second step is to deform Cauchy-Riemann equation $\bar\partial_J f = 0$ to inhomogeneous equation $\bar\partial_J f = \nu$. Consider a family of equations $\bar\partial_J f = t\nu$. We can repeat the argument of (ii) to show that $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k,\mu)}$ is independent of t.

Let $(\mathcal{B}^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}, \mathcal{F}^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}, \mathcal{S}^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})$ be VNA smooth compact V-triple of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_A(g,k,J,\nu)$ and define $\Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}, \chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}$ similarly. For the same reason, the virtual neighborhood construction applies. The third step is to construct a particular finite dimensional virtual neighborhood $(U^\mu_\nu, E^\mu_\nu, S^\mu_\nu)$ such that the restriction

$$\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} : U^\mu_\nu \to X^k \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_{g,k} \tag{4.11}$$

is transverse to $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i$.

First of all, since we work over **R**, we can assume that each α^* is represented by a bordism class, and hence an immersed submanifold by ordinary transversality. By the linearity (i), we can assume that K^* is represented by an immersed V-submanifold. Hence, $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*$ is represented by an immersed -submanifold (still denoted by $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*$). We first assume that $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*$ is an embedded V-submanifold. Recall that $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*$ does not meet the image of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu) - \mathcal{M}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$ and intersects transversely to the image $\mathcal{M}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$. Therefore,

$$(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*) \cap \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_A(g,k,J,\nu) \tag{4.12}$$

is a collection of the smooth points of $\mathcal{M}_A(g,k,J,\nu)$. It implies that L_x is surjective at $x \in (\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*) \cap \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_A(g,k,J,\nu)$ and

$$\delta(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^\mu_{g,k}) : KerL_A \to X^k \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\mu_{g,k} \tag{4.13}$$

is surjective onto the normal bundle of $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha_i$. Hence, the same is true over an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}'$ of $(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*) \cap \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$. We cover $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu)$ by $\mathcal{U}'$ and $\mathcal{U}''$ such that

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}'' \cap (\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^\mu_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i) = \emptyset. \tag{4.14}$$

Then, we construct $(\mathcal{E}^\mu_\nu, s^\mu_\nu)$ such that $s^\mu_\nu = 0$ over $\mathcal{U}' - \bar{\mathcal{U}}''$. Suppose that $(U^\mu_\nu, E^\mu_\nu, S^\mu_\nu)$ is the finite dimensional virtual neighborhood constructed by $(\mathcal{E}^\mu_\nu, s^\mu_\nu)$. It is easy to check that

$$(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i) \cap U^\mu_\nu \subset \mathcal{U}' - \bar{\mathcal{U}}''. \tag{4.15}$$

On the other hand,

$$s^{\mu}_{\nu} = 0 \text{ over } \mathcal{U}' - \bar{\mathcal{U}}''. \tag{4.16}$$

It implies that

$$(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*) \cap U^{\mu}_{\nu} = E^{\mu}_{\nu}|_{((\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i) \cap \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(\mu,g,k,J,\nu))}. \tag{4.17}$$

It is easy to observe that the restriction of $\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}$ to U^{μ}_{ν} is transverse to $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i$.

Since $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i$ is Poincare dual to $K \times \prod_i \alpha_i$, $(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*)$ is Poincare dual to $(\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^*(K \times \prod_i \alpha_i)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Psi^V_{(A,g,k,\mu)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) & = & \int_{U^{\mu}_{\nu}} (\Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^*(K \times \prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge (S^{\mu}_{\nu})^*(\Theta) \\ & = & \int_{(\Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k})^{-1}(K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*) \cap U^{\mu}_{\nu}} (S^{\mu}_{\nu})^*(\Theta) \\ & = & \Phi^V_{(A,g,k,\mu)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) \end{array} .$$

When $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i$ is an immersed V-submanifold, there is a V-manifold N and a smooth map

$$H : N \to X^k \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu}_{g,k}$$

whose image is $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i$. Then, we replace $\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k}$ by $\chi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times \Xi^{\mu,\nu}_{g,k} \times N$ and $K^* \times \prod_i \alpha^*_i$ by the diagonal of $(X^k \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu}_{g,k})^2$ in the previous argument. It will implies (iv). $\square$

It is well-known that the projection map $p : Y \to X$ defines a modular structure on $H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$ by $H^*(M, \mathbf{R})$, defined by

$$\alpha \cdot \beta = p^*(\alpha) \wedge \beta \tag{4.18}$$

where $\alpha \in H^*(M, \mathbf{R})$ and $\beta \in H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$. GW-invariant we defined behave nicely over this modulo structure, which is the basis of the modulo structure of equivariant quantum cohomology (Theorem I).

Proposition 4.3: *Suppose that $\alpha_i \in H^*(Y, \mathbf{R}), \alpha \in H^*(M, \mathbf{R})$. Then*

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha \cdot \alpha_i, \cdots, \alpha_j, \cdots, \alpha_k)$$

$$= \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_i, \cdots, \alpha \cdot \alpha_j, \cdots, \alpha_k). \tag{4.19}$$

Proof: By the definition,

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_i,\cdots,\alpha_j,\cdots,\alpha_k)$$
$$=\int_U \chi^*_{g,k}(K)\wedge\Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i)\wedge S^*(\Theta).$$

Let

$$p: Y^k\to V^k$$

and Δ be the diagonal of V^k. A crucial observation is that

$$\Xi^*_{g,k}:\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)\to Y^k$$

is factored through

$$\mathcal{B}_{g,k}\overset{\Xi'_{g,k}}{\to} p^{-1}(\Delta)\overset{i_{p^{-1}(\Delta)}}{\to} Y^k. \tag{4.20}$$

Furthermore, for any i

$$\begin{aligned} & i^*_{p^{-1}(\Delta)}(\alpha_1\times\cdots\times\alpha\cdot\alpha_i\times\cdots\alpha_k)\\ = \; & p^*(i^*_\Delta(1\times\cdots\times\alpha^{(i)}\times\cdots\times 1))\wedge i^*_{p^{-1}(\Delta)}(\alpha_1\times\cdots\times\alpha_i\times\cdots\alpha_k)\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where we use $\alpha^{(i)}$ to indicate that α is at the i-th component. However,

$$i^*_\Delta(1\times\cdots\times\alpha^{(i)}\times\cdots\times 1)=\alpha=i^*_\Delta(1\times\cdots\times\alpha^{(j)}\times\cdots\times 1). \tag{4.22}$$

Hence,

$$\Xi^*_{g,k}(\alpha_1\times\cdots\times\alpha\cdot\alpha_i\times\cdots\alpha_k)=\Xi^*_{g,k}(\alpha_1\times\cdots\times\alpha\cdot\alpha_j\times\cdots\alpha_k). \tag{4.23}$$

Then,

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha\cdot\alpha_i,\cdots,\alpha_j,\cdots,\alpha_k)$$
$$=\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_i,\cdots,\alpha\cdot\alpha_j,\cdots,\alpha_k).$$

□

As we mentioned in the introduction, there is a natural map

$$\pi:\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k-1} \tag{4.24}$$

by forgetting the last marked point and contracting the unstable rational component. One should be aware that there are two exceptional cases $(g,k)=(0,3),(1,1)$ where π is not well defined. π is not a fiber bundle, but a Lefschetz fibration. However, the integration over the fiber still holds for π. In another words, we have a map

$$\pi_*: H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}, \mathbf{R}) \to H^{*-2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k-1}, \mathbf{R}). \tag{4.25}$$

For a stable J-map $f \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$, let's also forget the last marked point x_k. If the resulting map is unstable, the unstable component is either a constant or non-constant map. If it is a constant map, we simply contract this component. If it is non-constant map, we divided it by the larger automorphism group. Then, we obtain a stable J-map in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k-1, J)$. Furthermore, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\chi_{g,k}: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
\chi_{g,k-1}: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k-1, J) \arrow[r] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k-1}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.26}$$

Associated with π, we have two *k-reduction formulas* for $\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}$.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $(g, k) \neq (0, 3), (1, 1)$.*

(1) For any $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1}$ in $H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$, we have

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1}, 1) \ = \ \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k-1)}(\pi_*(K); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1}) \tag{4.27}$$

(2) Let α_k be in $H^2(Y, \mathbf{R})$, then

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\pi^*(K); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_k) \ = \ \alpha_k(A)\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k-1)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1}) \tag{4.28}$$

where α^*_k is the Poincare dual of α_k.

Proof: Let $(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k), \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g, k), \mathcal{S}^A_{g,k})$ be the VNA smooth Banach compact V-triple of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J)$. Following from our construction of last section, we have commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\chi_{g,k}: \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
\chi_{g,k-1}: \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \arrow[r] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k-1}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.29}$$

Furthermore, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g, k) = \pi^*\overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g, k-1)$. Using the virtual neighborhood technique, we construct $(\mathcal{E}, s)$ and a finite dimensional virtual neighborhood $(U_{g,k-1}, E_{g,k-1}, S_{g,k-1})$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k-1, J)$. We observe that the same $(\mathcal{E}, s)$ also works in the construction of finite dimensional virtual neighborhood of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y,g,k,J)$. Let $(U_{g,k},E_{g,k},S_{g,k})$ be the virtual neighborhood. Then, $E_{g,k}$ is the pull back of $E_{g,k-1}$ by $\pi:\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{g,k}\to\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{g,k-1}$. There is a projection

$$\pi:U_{g,k}\to U_{g,k-1}. \tag{4.30}$$

Then,

$$S_{g,k}=S_{g,k-1}\circ\pi. \tag{4.31}$$

Hence,

$$S^*_{g,k}(\Theta)=\pi^*S^*_{g,k-1}(\Theta). \tag{4.32}$$

Moreover,

$$\Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i\wedge 1)=(\Xi_{g,k-1}\pi)^*(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i)=\pi^*\Xi^*_{g,k-1}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i). \tag{4.33}$$

Furthermore,

$$\pi_*\chi^*_{g,k}(K)=\chi^*_{g,k-1}(\pi_*(K)). \tag{4.34}$$

So,

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1},1) & = & \int_{U_{g,k}}\chi^*_{g,k}(K)\wedge\Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i\wedge 1)\wedge S^*_{g,k}(\Theta)\\ & = & \int_{U_{g,k-1}}\pi_*(\chi^*_{g,k}(K)\wedge\pi^*(\Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i)\wedge S^*_{g,k-1}(\Theta)))\\ & = & \int_{U_{g,k-1}}\chi^*_{g,k-1}(\pi_*K)\wedge\Xi^*_{g,k-1}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i)\wedge S_*(\Theta)\\ & = & \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\pi_*(K);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1})\end{array}. \tag{4.35}$$

On the other hand, for $\alpha_k\in H^2(Y,\mathbf{R})$,

$$\Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i\wedge\alpha_k)=\pi^*\Xi^*_{g,k-1}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i)\wedge e^*_k(\alpha_k), \tag{4.36}$$

where

$$e_i:\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y,g,k)\to Y \tag{4.37}$$

is the evaluation map at the marked point x_k. One can check that

$$\pi_*(e^*_k(\alpha_k))=\alpha_k(A). \tag{4.38}$$

Therefore,

(4.39)

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\pi^*(K);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k) & = & \int_{U_{g,k}} \chi^*_{g,k}(\pi^*(K)) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i \wedge \alpha_k) \wedge S^*_{g,k}(\Theta) \\ & = & \int_{U_{g,k-1}} \pi_*(\chi^*_{g,k}(\pi^*(K)) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_1^{k}\alpha_i \wedge \alpha_k) \wedge S^*_{g,k}(\Theta)) \\ & = & \int_{U_{g,k-1}} \chi^*_{g,k-1}(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k-1}(\prod_1^{k-1}\alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{g,k-1}(\Theta) \wedge \pi_*(e^*_k(\alpha_k)) \\ & = & \alpha_k(A)\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k-1)}(K;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{k-1}) \end{array}.$$

□

Let $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{g,k}$ be the universal curve over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$. Then each marked point x_i gives rise to a section, still denoted by x_i, of the fibration $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{g,k} \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$. If $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{M}}$ denotes the cotangent bundle to fibers of this fibration, we put $\mathcal{L}_{(i)} = x_i^*(\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{M}})$. Following Witten, we put

$$\langle \tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_k,\alpha_k}\rangle_g(q) = \sum_{A\in H_2(X,\mathbf{Z})} \Psi^X_{(A,g,k)}(K_{d_1,\cdots,d_k};\{\alpha_i\})\, q^A \tag{4.40}$$

where $\alpha_i \in H_*(V,\mathbf{Q})$ and $[K_{d_1,\cdots,d_k}] = c_1(\mathcal{L}_{(1)})^{d_1} \cup \cdots \cup c_1(\mathcal{L}_{(k)})^{d_k}$ and q is an element of Novikov ring. Symbolically, $\tau_{d,\alpha}$'s denote "quantum field theory operators". For simplicity, we only consider the cohomology classes of even degree. Choose a basis $\{\beta_a\}_{1\leq a\leq N}$ of $H^{*,\mathrm{even}}(V,\mathbf{Z})$ modulo torsion. We introduce formal variables t^a_r, where $r = 0,1,2,\cdots$ and $1 \leq a \leq N$. Witten's generating function (cf. [W2]) is now simply defined to be

$$F^X(t^a_r;q) = \langle e^{\sum_{r,a} t^a_r \tau_{r,\beta_a}}\rangle(q)\lambda^{2g-2} = \sum_{n_{r,a}}\prod_{r,a}\frac{(t^a_r)^{n_{r,a}}}{n_{r,a}!}\left\langle \prod_{r,a}\tau^{n_{r,a}}_{r,\beta_a}\right\rangle(q)\lambda^{2g-2} \tag{4.41}$$

where $n_{r,a}$ are arbitrary collections of nonnegative integers, almost all zero, labeled by r,a. The summation in (4.40) is over all values of the genus g and all homotopy classes A of J-maps. Sometimes, we write F^X_g to be the part of F^X involving only GW-invariants of genus g. Using the argument of Lemma 6.1 ([RT2]), Proposition 4.4 implies that the generating function satisfies several equation.

Corollary 4.5. *Let X be a symplectic manifold. F^X satisfies the generalized string equation*

$$\frac{\partial F^X}{\partial t^1_0} = \frac{1}{2}\eta_{ab}t^a_0t^b_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_a t^a_{i+1}\frac{\partial F^X}{\partial t^a_i}. \tag{4.42}$$

F^X_g satisfies the dilaton equation

$$\frac{\partial F^X_g}{\partial t^1_1} = (2g-2+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_a t^a_i\frac{\partial}{\partial t^a_i})F^X_g + \frac{\chi(X)}{24}\delta_{g,1}, \tag{4.43}$$

where $\chi(X)$ is the Euler characteristic of X.

Next, we prove the composition law. Recall the construction in the introduction. Assume $g = g_1 + g_2$ and $k = k_1 + k_2$ with $2g_i + k_i \geq 3$. Fix a decomposition $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ of $\{1, \cdots, k\}$ with $|S_i| = k_i$. Recall that $\theta_S : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,k_2+1} \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$, which assigns to marked curves $(\Sigma_i; x^i_1, \cdots, x^i_{k_1+1})$ $(i = 1, 2)$, their union $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ with $x^1_{k_1+1}$ identified to x^2_1 and remaining points renumbered by $\{1, \cdots, k\}$ according to S. Clearly, $im(\theta_S)$ is a V-submanifold of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$, where the Poincare duality holds. Recall the transfer map

Definition 4.6: *Suppose that X, Y are two topological space such that Poincare duality holds over $\mathbf{R}$. Let $f : X \to Y$. Then, the transfer map*

$$f_! : H^*(X, \mathbf{R}) \to H^*(Y, \mathbf{R}) \tag{4.44}$$

is defined by $f_!(K) = PD(f_*(PD(K)))$.

We have another natural map defined in the introduction $\mu : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,k+2} \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ by gluing together the last two marked points. Clearly, $im(\mu)$ is also a V-submanifold of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$.

Choose a homogeneous basis $\{\beta_b\}_{1 \leq b \leq L}$ of $H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$. Let (η_{ab}) be its intersection matrix. Note that $\eta_{ab} = \beta_a \cdot \beta_b = 0$ if the dimensions of β_a and β_b are not complementary to each other. Put (η^{ab}) to be the inverse of (η_{ab}). Let $\delta \subset Y \times Y$ be the diagonal. Then, its Poincare dual

$$\delta^* = \sum_{a,b} \eta^{ab} \beta_a \otimes \beta_b. \tag{4.45}$$

Now we can state the composition law, which consists of two formulas.

Theorem 4.7: *Let $K_i \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_i,k_i+1}, \mathbf{R})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and $K_0 \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,k+2}, \mathbf{R})$. For any $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k$ in $H^*(Y, \mathbf{R})$. Then we have (1).*

(4.46)

$$\begin{aligned} &\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}((\theta_S)_!(K_1 \times K_2])\{\alpha_i\}) \\ = (-1)^{deg(K_2)\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} deg(\alpha_i)} &\sum_{A=A_1+A_2} \sum_{a,b} \Psi^Y_{(A_1,g_1,k_1+1)}(K_1; \{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k}, \beta_a) \eta^{ab} \Psi^Y_{(A_2,g_2,k_2+1)}(K_2; \beta_b, \{\alpha_j\}_{j>k}) \end{aligned}$$

(2).

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(\mu_!(K_0); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) = \sum_{a,b} \Psi^Y_{(A,g-1,k+2)}(K_0; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k, \beta_a, \beta_b) \eta^{ab} \tag{4.47}$$

Proof: The proof of the theorem is divided into two steps. First of all,

$$\chi_{g,k} : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \tag{4.48}$$

is a submersion. $\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)} = \chi_{g,k}^{-1}(Im(\theta_S))$ is a union of some lower strata of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$. Moreover, it is also weakly smooth. Consider weakly smooth Banach compact-V triple $(\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)}, \mathcal{F}_{im(\theta_S)}, S_{im(\theta_S)})$. We can use it to define invariant $\Psi_{(A,\theta_S)}$. The first step is to show that

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(i_!(K); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) = \Psi_{(A,\theta_S)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k), \tag{4.49}$$

Let $(im(\theta_S))^*$ be the Poincare dual of $im(\theta_S)$. $(im(\theta_S))^*$ can be chosen to be supported in a tubular neighborhood of $im(\theta_S)$, which can be identified with a neighborhood of zero section of normal bundle. For any $K \in H^*(im(\theta_S), \mathbf{R})$, we can pull it back to the total space of normal bundle (denoted by $K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}}$). Then, $K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}}$ is defined over a tubular neighborhood of $im(\theta_S)$. Since $(im(\theta_S))^*$ is supported in the tubular neighborhood,

$$(im(\theta_S))^* \wedge K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}} \tag{4.50}$$

is a closed differential form defined over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$. In fact,

$$i_!(K) = (im(\theta_S))^* \wedge K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}}. \tag{4.51}$$

First we construct that $(\mathcal{E}, s)$ for $(\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)}, \mathcal{F}_{im(\theta_S)}, S_{im(\theta_S)})$. Suppose that the virtual neighborhood is $(U_{im(\theta_S)}, E_{im\theta_S}, S_{im(\theta_S)})$. We first extend s over a neighborhood in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$. Then, we construct s' supported away from $im(\theta_S)$. Suppose that the stabilization term is $(\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{E}', s + s')$ such that

$$L_x + s + s' + \delta(\chi_{g,k}) : T_x\mathcal{B}_{g,k} \oplus \mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{E}' \to \mathcal{F}_x \times T_{\chi_{g,k}(x)}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$$

is surjective over $\mathcal{U}$ in the construction of (4.14-4.16). Suppose that the resulting finite dimensional virtual neighborhood is $(U_{g,k}, E \oplus E', S_{g,k})$. Then,

$$\chi_{g,k} : U_{g,k} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k} \tag{4.52}$$

is a submersion and

$$\chi_{g,k}^{-1}(im(\theta_S)) = E'_{U_{im(\theta_S)}} \subset U_{g,k} \tag{4.53}$$

is a V-submanifold. Then, $\chi^*_{g,k}((im(\theta_S))^*)$ is Poincare dual to $E'_{U_{im(\theta_S)}}$. Choose Thom forms Θ_1, Θ_2 of E, E' Therefore,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k)}(i_!(K); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) & = & \int_{U_{g,k}} (im(\theta_S))^*) \wedge \chi^*_{g,k}(K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}} \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{g,k}(\Theta_1 \wedge \Theta_2) \\ & = & \int_{U_{im(\theta_S)} \times \mathbf{R}^{m'}/G'} \chi^*_{g,k}(K_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}}) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{g,k}(\Theta_1 \wedge \Theta_2) \\ & = & \int_{U_{im(\theta_S)}} \chi^*_{g,k}(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{g,k}(\Theta_1) \\ & = & \Psi^Y_{(A,\theta_S)}(K; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) \end{array} . \tag{4.55}$$

The second step is to show that $\Psi^Y_{(A,\theta_S)}$ can be expressed by the formula (1). By the construction in the last section, we have a submersion

$$e^{A_1}_{k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{k_2+1} : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g_1, k_1+1) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g_2, k_2+1) \to Y \times Y \tag{4.56}$$

such that

$$\bigcup_{A_1+A_2=A} (e^{A_1}_{k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{k_2+1})^{-1}(\Delta) = \mathcal{B}_{Im(\theta_S)} \tag{4.57}$$

where $\delta \subset Y \times Y$ is the diagonal. By Gromov-compactness theorem, there are only finite many such pairs (A_1, A_2) we need. Notes that

$$(e^{A_1}_{k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{k_2+1})^{-1}(\Delta) \cap (e^{A'_1}_{k_1+1} \times e^{A'_2}_{k_2+1})^{-1}(\Delta) \tag{4.58}$$

may be nonempty for some $(A_1, A_2) \neq (A'_1, A'_2)$. But it is in lower strata of $\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)}$ of codimension at least two. Furthermore, by the construction of the section 3

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g, k)|_{\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)}} = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g_1, k_1+1) \times \overline{\mathcal{F}}_A(Y, g_2, k_2+1)|_{\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)}}. \tag{4.59}$$

We want to construct *a system of stabilization terms compatible with the stratification.* The idea is to start from the bottom strata and construct inductively the stabilization term supported away from lower strata. The same construction is crucial in the construction of Floer homology. We choose to wait until the last section to give the detail (called a system of stablization terms compatible with the corner structure in the last section). Let s_1, s_2 be the stablization terms for

$$(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{A_1}(Y, g_1, k_1+1), \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{A_1}(g_1, K_1+1), \mathcal{S}^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1}), (\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{A_2}(Y, g_1, k_1+1), \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{A_2}(Y, g_1, K_1+1), \mathcal{S}^{A_2}_{g_1,k_1+1}).$$

Suppose that the resulting virtual neighborhoods are

$$(U^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1}, E, S^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1}), (U^{A_2}_{g_1,k_1+1}, E', S^{A_2}_{g_1,k_1+1}).$$

By (4.56) and adding sections if necessary, we can assume that

$$e^{A_1}_{k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{k_2+1} : U^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times U^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1} \to Y \times Y \tag{4.60}$$

is a submersion. Let

$$U_{A_1,A_2} = (e^{A_1}_{k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{k_2+1})^{-1}(\Delta) \subset U^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times U^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1}. \tag{4.61}$$

One consequence of our system of stabilization compatible with the stratification is

$$U_{A_1,A_2} \cap U_{A'_1,A'_2}$$

is a V-submanifold of codimension at least two for both U_{A_1,A_2} and $U_{A'_1,A'_2}$ if $(A_1, A_2) \neq (A'_1, A'_2)$. Then,

$$(\bigcup_{A_1+A_2=A} U_{A_1,A_2}, E \oplus E', S_{A_1} \times S_{A_2}) \tag{4.62}$$

is a finite dimensional virtual neighborhood of $(\mathcal{B}_{im(\theta_S)}, \mathcal{F}_{im(\theta_S)}, \mathcal{S}_{im(\theta_S)})$. Moreover, we can choose stabilization term such that both E and E' are of even rank. Let δ^* be the Poincare dual of δ. Then, $(e^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1})^*(\delta^*)$ is Poincare dual to U_{A_1,A_2}. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi^Y_{(A,\theta_S)}(K_1 \times K_2; \{\alpha_i\}) \\
= \ & \textstyle\int_{\cup_{A_1+A_2=A} U_{A_1,A_2}} \chi^*_{g,k}(K_1 \times K_2) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{A_1}(\Theta_1) \wedge S^*_{A_2}(\Theta_2) \\
= \ & \textstyle\sum_{A_1+A_2=A} \int_{U_{A_1,A_2}} \chi^*_{g,k}(K_1 \times K_2) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{A_1}(\Theta_1) \wedge S^*_{A_2}(\Theta_2) \\
= \ & \textstyle\sum_{A_1+A_2=A} \int_{U^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times U^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1}} (e^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times e^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1})^*(\delta^*) \wedge \chi^*_{g,k}(K_1 \times K_2) \\
& \textstyle\wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{A_1}(\Theta_1) \wedge S^*_{A_2}(\Theta_2) \\
= \ & \textstyle\sum_{A_1+A_2=A} \sum_{a,b} \eta^{ab} \int_{U^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1} \times U^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1}} (e^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1})^* \beta_a \wedge (e^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1})^*(\beta_b) \\
& \textstyle\wedge \chi^*_{g,k}(K_1 \times K_2) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*_{A_1}(\Theta_1) \wedge S^*_{A_2}(\Theta_2) \\
= \ & \textstyle(-1)^{deg(K_2) \sum^{k_1} i=1 deg(\alpha_i)} \sum_{A_1+A_2=A} \\
& \textstyle\sum_{a,b} \eta^{ab} \int_{U^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1}} \chi^*_{g_1,k_1+1}(K_1) \wedge \Xi^*_{g_1,k_1}(\prod^{k_1}_i \alpha_i)(e^{A_1}_{g_1,k_1+1})^* \beta_a \wedge S^*_{A_1}(\Theta_1) \\
& \textstyle\int_{U^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1}} (\chi^*_{g_2,k_2+1}(K_2) e^{A_2}_{g_2,k_2+1})^* \beta_b \wedge \Xi^*_{g_2,k_2}(\prod_{j>k_1} \alpha_j) \wedge S^*_{A_2}(\Theta_2) \\
= \ & \textstyle(-1)^{deg(K_2) \sum^{k_1} i=1 deg(\alpha_i)} \sum_{A_1+A_2=A} \\
& \textstyle\sum_{a,b} \eta^{ab} \Psi^Y_{(A,g_1,k_1+1)}(K_1; \{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k_1}, \beta_a) \Psi^Y_{(A_2,g_2,k_2+1)}(K_2; \{\alpha_j\}_{j>k_1}, \beta_b).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

The Proof of (2) is similar. We leave it to readers.

Corollary 4.8: *Quantum multiplication is associative and hence there is a quantum ring structure over any symplectic manifolds.*

Proof: The proof is well-known (see [RT1]). We omit it. □

Here, we give another application to higher dimensional algebraic geometry. Recall that a Kahler manifold W is called uniruled if W is covered by rational curves. As we mentioned in the beginning, Kollar showed that if W is a 3-fold, the uniruledness is a symplectic property [K1]. Combined Kollar's argument with our construction, we generalize this result to general symplectic manifolds.

Proposition 4.9: If a smooth Kahler manifold W is symplectic deformation equivalent to a uniruled manifold, W is uniruled.

First we need following

Lemma 4.10: *Suppose that $N \subset Y$ is a submanifold such that for any $x \in \mathcal{M}_N = (\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, g, k, J) \cap e_1^{-1}(N))$*

$$CokerL_x = 0 \ and \ \delta(e_1) : L_x \to T_{e_1(x)}Y \tag{4.64}$$

is surjective onto the normal bundle of N. Then, $\mathcal{M}_N$ is a smooth V-manifold of dimensional $ind - Cod(N)$ and

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,g,k+1)}(K; N^*, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) = (-1)^{deg(K)deg(N^*)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_N} \chi^*_{g,k+1}(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i). \tag{4.65}$$

Proof: Since $e_1 : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{g,k+1} \to Y$ is a submersion, we can construct $(\mathcal{E}, s)$ such that $s = 0$ over a neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}_N$ and

$$e_1|_U : U \to Y$$

is transverse to N, where (U, E, S) is the virtual neighborhood constructed by $(\mathcal{E}, s)$. Therefore,

$$(e_1|_U)^{-1}(N) = E_{\mathcal{M}_N} \tag{4.66}$$

is a smooth V-submanifold of U. Thus, $e_1^*(N^*)$ is Poincare dual to $E_{\mathcal{M}_N}$.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Psi^Y_{(A,g,k+1)}(K; N^*, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) & = & \int_U \chi^*_{g,k+1}(K) \wedge e_1^*(N^*) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*(\Theta) \\ & = & (-1)^{deg(K)deg(N^*)} \int_{E_{\mathcal{M}_N}} \chi^*_{g,k+1}(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \wedge S^*(\Theta) \ . \\ & = & (-1)^{deg(K)deg(N^*)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_N} \chi^*_{g,k+1}(K) \wedge \Xi^*_{g,k}(\prod_i \alpha_i) \end{array} \tag{4.67}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.9: If $\Psi^Y_{(A,0,k+1)}(K; pt, \cdots) \neq 0$, then W is covered by rational curves. Otherwise, there is a point x_0 where there is no rational curve passing through x_0.

$$\mathcal{M}_N = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(Y, 0, k, J) \cap e_1^{-1}(N) = \emptyset \tag{4.68}$$

for any A, k. The condition of Lemma 4.10 is obviously satisfied. By Lemma 4.10,

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,0,k+1)}(K; pt, \cdots) = 0$$

and this is a contradiction.

Since GW-invariant $\Psi^Y_{(A,0,k+1)}(K; pt, \cdots)$ is a symplectic deformation invariant property, it is enough to show that if W is uniruled, $\Psi^Y_{(A,0,k+1)}(K; pt, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) \neq 0$ for some K, $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k$. Assuming Lemma 4.10, Kollar showed some $\Psi^W_{(A,0,3)}(pt; pt, \alpha, \beta)$ is not zero for some A and α, β. His argument uses Mori's machinery. Here we give a more elementary argument to show that

$$\Psi^Y_{(A,0,k+1)}(pt; pt, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k) \neq 0 \tag{4.69}$$

for some A and some α_i with $k >> 0$. Then, using the composition law we proved, we can derive Kollar's calculation.

First, we repeat some of Kollar's argument. By [K], for a generic point x_0, $\mathcal{M}_A(W, 0, k, J) \cap e_1^{-1}(x_0)$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 4.10 for any A. Next choose A_0 such that

$$H(A_0) = min_A\{H(A); \mathcal{M}_A(W, 0, k, J) \cap e_1^{-1}(x_0) \neq \emptyset\}. \tag{4.70}$$

where H is an ample line bundle. Then, one can check that

$$(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(W, 0, k, J) - \mathcal{M}_A(W, 0, k, J)) \cap e_1^{-1}(x_0) = \emptyset.$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{M}_{x_0} = \mathcal{M}_A(W, 0, k, J) \cap e_1^{-1}(x_0)$ is a compact, smooth, complex manifold. In particular, it carries a fundamental class.

Next, we show that

$$\Xi_{0,k} : \mathcal{M}_{x_0} \to W^k \tag{4.71}$$

is an immersion for large $k >> 0$. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{x_0}$,

$$T_f\mathcal{M}_{x_0} = \{v \in H^0(f^*TV); v(x_0) = 0\}. \tag{4.72}$$

Since $v_f \in H^0(f^*TV)$ is holomorphic, there are finite many points $x_2, \cdots, x_{k+1}$ such that if for any v_f with $v_f(x_i) = 0$ for every i, $v_f = 0$. One can check that

$$\delta(\Xi_{0,k})_f(v) = (v(x_2), \cdots, v(x_k)). \tag{4.73}$$

Therefore, $\delta(\Xi_{0,k})$ is injective.

Since $\Xi_{0,k}$ is an immersion, $\Xi_{0,k}(\mathcal{M}_{x_0}) \subset W^k$ is a compact complex subvariety of the same dimension. Hence, it carries a nonzero homology class $[\Xi_{0,k}(\mathcal{M}_{x_0})]$. Furthermore, $(\Xi_{0,k})_*([\mathcal{M}_{x_0}]) = \lambda[\Xi_{0,k}(\mathcal{M}_{x_0})]$ for some $\lambda > 0$. By Poincare duality, there are $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k$ such that

$$\prod_i \alpha_i([\Xi_{0,k}(\mathcal{M}_{x_0})]) \neq 0. \tag{4.74}$$

By Lemma 4.10,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^W_{(A,g,k+1)}(pt;pt,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k) &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_{x_0}}\Xi^*_{0,k}(\textstyle\prod_i \alpha_i)\\ &= (\textstyle\prod_i\alpha_i)(\Xi_*([\mathcal{M}_{x_0}]))\neq 0\end{aligned} \tag{4.75}$$

□

5 Equivariant GW-invariants and Equivariant quantum cohomology

We will study the equivariant GW-invariants and the equivariant quantum cohomology in detail in this section. The equivariant theory is an important topic. It has been studied by several authors [AB], [GK]. As we mentioned in the [R4], equivariant theory is the one that usual Donaldson method has trouble to deal with, where there are topological obstructions to choose a "generic" parameter. But our virtual neighborhood method is particularly suitable to study equivariant theory. In our case, one can attempt to choose an equivariant almost complex structure and apply the equivariant virtual neighborhood technique. However, a technically simpler approach is to view the equivariant GW-invariants as a limit of GW-invariants for the families of symplectic manifolds. This approach was advocated by [GK], where they formulated some conjectural properties for the equivariant GW-invariants and the equivariant quantum cohomology. First work to give a rigorous foundation of the equivariant GW-invariants and the equivariant quantum cohomology was given by Lu [Lu] for monotonic symplectic manifolds, where he used the method of [RT1], [RT2]. Here, we use the invariants we established in last section to establish the equivariant GW-invariants and the equivariant quantum cohomology for general symplectic manifolds.

Let's recall the construction of the introduction. Suppose that G acts on (X,ω) as symplectomorphisms. Let BG be the classifying space of G and $EG\rightarrow BG$ be the universal G-bundle. Suppose that

$$BG_1\subset BG_2\cdots\subset BG_m\subset BG \tag{5.1}$$

such that BG_i is a smooth oriented compact manifold and $BG=\cup_i BG_i$. Let

$$EG_1\subset EG_2\cdots\subset EG_m\subset BG \tag{5.2}$$

be the corresponding universal bundles. We can also form the approximation of homotopy quotient $X_G=X\times EG/G$ by $X^i_G=X\times EG_i/G$. Since ω is invariant under G, its pull-back on $V\times EG_i$

descends to V_G^i. So, we have a family of symplectic manifold $P_i : X^i \to BG_i$. Applying our previous construction, we obtain GW-invariant $\Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k)}$. We define equivariant GW-invariant

$$(5.3) \qquad \Psi^G_{(A,g,k)} \in Hom(H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}, \mathbf{R}) \otimes (H^*(V_G, \mathbf{R}))^{\otimes k}, H^*(BG, \mathbf{R}))$$

as follow:

For any $D \in H_*(BG, \mathbf{Z})$, $D \in H_*(BG_i, \mathbf{Z})$ for some i. For any $K \in H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}, \mathbf{R})$, $\pi^*(K) \in H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k+1}, \mathbf{R})$. Let $i_{X^i_G} : X^i_G \to X_G$.

Definition 5.1: *For $\alpha_i \in H^*_G(X, \mathbf{R})$, we define*

$$(5.4) \qquad \Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}(K, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)(D) = \Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K); i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_1), \cdots, i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_k), P_i^*(D^*_{BG_i})),$$

where $D^*_{BG_i}$ is the Poincare dual of D with respect to BG_i.

Theorem 5.2: *(i). $\Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}$ is independent of the choice of BG_i.*

(ii). If ω_t is a family of G-invariant symplectic forms, $\Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}$ is independent of ω_t.

Proof: The proof is similar to the third step of the proof of Proposition 4.2(iv). Choose a G-invariant tamed almost complex structure J on X. It induces a tamed almost complex structure (still denoted by J) over every X^i_G. Clearly, there is a natural inclusion map

$$(5.5) \qquad \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(X^i_G, g, k, J) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(X^j_G, g, k, J) \text{ for } i \leq j.$$

Suppose that $(\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{S}_i)$ is the configuration space of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(X^i_G, g, k, J)$. Then, there is a natural inclusion.

$$(5.6) \qquad (\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{S}_i) \subset (\mathcal{B}_j, \mathcal{F}_j, \mathcal{S}_j) \text{ for } i \leq j.$$

We first construct $(\mathcal{E}_i, s_i)$ for $(\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{S}_i)$. Suppose that the resulting finite dimensional virtual neighborhood is (U_i, E_i, S_i). Then, we extend s_i over $\mathcal{B}_j$. Since $L_A + s_i$ is surjective over $\mathcal{U}_i \subset \mathcal{B}_i$. We can construct $(\mathcal{E}_j, s_j)$ such that $s_j = 0$ over $\mathcal{U}_i$ and $L_A + s_i + s_j$ is surjective over $\mathcal{U}_j$. Suppose that the resulting finite dimensional virtual neighborhood is $(U_j, E_i \oplus E_j, S_j)$. Then,

$$U_j \cap (\mathcal{E}_j)_{\mathcal{B}_i} = (E_j)_{U_i} \subset U_j$$

is a V-submanifold. Let

$$(5.7) \qquad e^j_{k+1} : \mathcal{B}_j \to X^j_B$$

be the evaluation map at x_{k+1}. Then, we can choose s_i, s_j such that the restriction of e^j_{k+1} to U_j is a submersion. Furthermore, since $(e^j_{k+1})^{-1}(X^i_G) = \mathcal{B}_i$,

$$(e^j_{k+1})^{-1}(X^i_G) \cap U_j = (E_j)_{U_i}. \tag{5.8}$$

Notes that

$$S_j \circ i = S_i, \tag{5.9}$$

where $i : (E_j)_{U_i} \to U_j$ is the inclusion. Choose Thom forms Θ_i, Θ_j of E_i, E_j. Let's use I_{ij} to denote the inclusion $\mathcal{B}_i \subset \mathcal{B}_j$, $BG_i \subset BG_j$ and $X^i_G \subset X^j_G$ and define $\Xi^i_{g,k}, \chi^i_{g,k}$ similarly. Then

$$\Xi^j_{g,k} \circ I_{ij} = I_{ij} \Xi^i_{g,k}, \text{ and } \chi^j_{g,k} \circ I_{ij} = \chi^i_{g,k}. \tag{5.11}$$

Furthermore,

$$D^*_{BG_j} = (I_{ij})_! D^*_{BG_i}. \tag{5.12}$$

Let $(BG_i)^*_j$ be the Poincare dual of BG_i in BG_j. Choose $(BG_i)^*_j$ supported in a tubular neighborhood of BG_i. By Lemma 2.10,

$$D^*_{BG_j} = (D^*_{BG_i})_{BG_j} \wedge (BG_i)^*_j. \tag{5.13}$$

Furthermore, $P^*_j((BG_i)^*_j)$ is Poincare dual to X^i_G in X^j_G. Hence, $(e^j_{k+1})^* P^*_j((BG_i)^*_j)$ is Poincare dual to $(E_j)_{U_i}$.

(5.14)

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \Psi^{X^j_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K), i^*_{X^j_G}(\alpha_1), \cdots, i^*_{X^j_G}(\alpha_k), P^*_j(D^*_{BG_j})) \\ = & \int_{U_j} \chi^j_{g,k+1}(\pi^*(K)) \wedge \Xi^i_{g,k}(\prod_m i^*_{X^j_G}(\alpha_m)) \wedge (e^j_{k+1})^* P^*_j(D^*_{BG_j}) \wedge S^*_j(\Theta_i \times \Theta_j) \\ = & \int_{U_j} \chi^j_{g,k+1}(\pi^*(K)) \wedge \Xi^j_{g,k}(\prod_m i^*_{X^j_G}(\alpha_m)) \wedge (e^j_{k+1})^* P^*_j((D^*_{BG_i})_{BG_j}) \wedge (e^j_{k+1})^* P^*_j((BG_i)^*_j) \wedge S^*_j(\Theta_i \times \Theta_j) \\ = & \int_{(E_j)_{U_i}} \chi^i_{g,k+1}(\pi^*(K)) \wedge \Xi^i_{g,k}(\prod_m i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_m)) \wedge (e^i_{k+1})^* P^*_i(D^*_{BG_i}) \wedge S^*_j(\Theta_i \times \Theta_j) \\ = & \int_{U_i} \chi^i_{g,k+1}(\pi^*(K)) \wedge \Xi^i_{g,k}(\prod_m i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_m)) \wedge (e^i_{k+1})^* P^*_i(D^*_{BG_i}) \wedge S^*_i(\Theta_i) \\ = & \Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K); i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_1), \cdots, i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_k), P^*_i(D^*_{BG_i})) \end{array}.$$

(ii) follows from the same property of $\Psi^{X^i_G}$. □

As we discussed in the introduction, for any equivariant cohomology class $\alpha \in H^*_G(X)$, we can evaluate over the fundamental class of X

$$\alpha[X] \in H^*(BG). \tag{5.15}$$

Furthermore, there is a modulo structure by $H^*_G(pt) = H^*(BG)$, defined by using the projection map

$$X_G \to BG. \tag{5.16}$$

The equivariant quantum multiplication is a new multiplication structure over $H^*_G(X, \Lambda_\omega) = H^*(X_G, \Lambda_\omega)$ as follows. We first define a total 3-point function

$$\Psi^G_{(X,\omega)}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \sum_A \Psi^G_{(A,0,3)}(pt; \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) q^A. \tag{5.17}$$

Then, we define an equivariant quantum multiplication by

$$(\alpha \times_{QG} \beta) \cup \gamma[X] = \Psi^G_{(X,\omega)}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3). \tag{5.18}$$

Theorem I: *(i) The equivariant quantum multiplication is skew-symmetry.*

(ii) The equivariant quantum multiplication is commutative with the modulo structure of $H^*(BG)$.

(iii) The equivariant quantum multiplication is associative.

Hence, there is a equivariant quantum ring structure for any G *and any symplectic manifold* V

Proof: (i) follows from the definition. By the proposition 5.2, for any $\alpha \in H^*(BG, \mathbf{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K); i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_1), \cdots, P^*_i(i_{BG_i})^*(\alpha) \wedge i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_j), \cdots, i_{X^i_G}(\alpha_k), P^*_i(D^*_{BG_i})) \\
= \; & \Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K); i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha), i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_2), \cdots, i_{X^i_G}(\alpha_k), P^*_i(i_{BG_i})^*(\alpha) \wedge P^*_i(D^*_{BG_i})) \\
= \; & \Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K); i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha), i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_2), \cdots, i_{X^i_G}(\alpha_k), P^*_i(i_{BG_i})^*(\alpha \wedge D^*_{BG_i})) \\
= \; & \Psi^{X^i_G}_{(A,g,k+1)}(\pi^*(K); i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha), i^*_{X^i_G}(\alpha_2), \cdots, i_{X^i_G}(\alpha_k), P^*_i(i_{BG_i})^*((\alpha(D)^*_{BG_i})) \\
= \; & \Psi^G_{(A,g,k)}(K, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_k)(\alpha(D))
\end{aligned} \quad . \tag{5.19}$$

Then, (ii) follows from the definition.

The proof of (iii) is the same as the case of the ordinary quantum cohomology. We omit it. □

6 Floer homology and Arnold conjecture

In this section, we will extend our construction of previous sections to Floer homology to remove the semi-positive condition. Floer homology was first introduced by Floer in an attempt to solve Arnold conjecture [F]. The original Floer homology was only defined for monotonic symplectic manifolds. Floer solved Arnold conjecture in the same category. The Floer homology for semi-positive symplectic manifolds was defined by Hofer and Salamon [HS]. Arnold conjecture for semi-positive symplectic manifolds were solved by [HS] and [O]. Roughly speaking, there are two difficulties to solve Arnold conjecture for general symplectic manifolds,i.e., (i) to extend Floer homology to general symplectic manifolds and (ii) to show that Floer homology is the same as ordinary homology. For the second problem, the traditional method is to deform a Hamiltonian function to a small Morse function and calculate its Floer homology directly. This approach involved some delicate analysis about the contribution of trajectories which are not gradient flow lines of a Morse function. It has only been carried out for semi-positive symplectic manifolds [O]. But the author and Tian showed [RT3] that this part of difficulties can be avoided by introducing a Bott-type Floer homology, where we can deform a Hamiltonian function to zero. The difficulty to extend Floer homology for a general symplectic manifold is the same as the difficulty to extend GW-invariant to a general symplectic manifold. Once we establish the GW-invariant for general symplectic manifolds, it is probably not surprising to experts that the same technique can work for Floer homology. Since many of the construction here is similar to that of last several sections, we shall be sketch in this section.

Let's recall the set-up of [HS]. Let (X,ω) be a closed symplectic manifold. Given any function H on $X \times S^1$, we can associate a vector field X_H as follow:

$$\omega(X_H(z,t),v) = v(H)(z,t), \qquad \text{for any } v \in T_zV \tag{6.1}$$

We call H a periodic Hamiltonian and X_H a Hamiltonian vector field associated to H. Let $\phi_t(H)$ be the integral flow of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H. Then $\phi_1(H)$ is a Hamiltonian symplectomorphism.

Definition 6.1. *We call a periodic Hamiltonian H to be non-degenerate if and only if the fixed-point set $F(\phi_1(H))$ of $\phi_1(H)$ is non-degenerate.*

Let $\mathcal{L}(X)$ be the space of contractible maps (sometimes called contractible loops) from S^1 into X and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(X)$ be the universal cover of $\mathcal{L}(X)$, namely, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(X)$ is as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(X) = \{(x,u) | x \in \mathcal{L}(X), u : D^2 \to X \text{ such that } x = u|_{\partial D^2}\}/\sim, \tag{6.2}$$

where the equivalence relation $\sim$ is the homotopic equivalence of x. The covering group of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ over $\mathcal{L}$ is $\pi_2(V)$. We can define a symplectic action functional on $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(X)$,

$$a_H((x,u)) = \int_{D^2} u^*\omega + \int_{S^1} H(t,x(t))dt \tag{6.3}$$

It follows from the closeness of ω that a_H descends to the quotient space by $\sim$. The Euler-Lagrange equation of a_H is

$$\dot{u} - X_H(t, u(t)) = 0 \tag{6.4}$$

Let $\mathbf{R}(H)$ be the critical point set of a_H, i.e., the set of smooth contractible loops satisfying the Euler-Lagrange equation. The image $\bar{\mathbf{R}}(H)$ of $\mathbf{R}(H)$ in $\mathcal{L}(V)$ one-to-one corresponds to the fixed points of $\phi_1(H)$ and hence is a finite set. Since $\phi_1(H)$ is non-degenerate, it implies that $\mathbf{R}(H)$ is the set of non-degenerate critical points of $a(H)$. But $\mathbf{R}(H)$ may have infinitely many points, which are generated by the covering transformation group $\pi_2(V)$.

Given $(x, u) \in \mathbf{R}(H)$, choose a symplectic trivialization

$$\Phi(t) : \mathbf{R}^{2n} \to T_{x(t)}V$$

of u^*TV which extends over the disc D. Linearizing the Hamiltonian differential equation along $x(t)$, we obtain a path of symplectic matrices

$$A(t) = \Phi(t)^{-1} d\phi_t(x(0))\Phi(0) \in Sp(2n, \mathbf{R}).$$

Here the symplectomorphism $\phi_t : X \to X$ denotes the time-t-map of the Hamiltonian flow

$$\dot{\phi}_t = \nabla H_t(\phi_t).$$

Then, $A(0) = Id$ and $A(1)$ is conjugate to $d\phi_1(x(0))$. Non-degeneracy means that 1 is not an eigenvalue of $A(1)$. Then, we can assign a Conley Zehnder index for $A(t)$. We can decomposed $\mathbf{R}(H)$ as

$$\mathbf{R}(H) = \cup_i \mathbf{R}_i(H),$$

where $\mathbf{R}_i(H)$ consists of critical points in $\mathbf{R}(H)$ with the Conley-Zehnder index i.

To define Floer homology, we first construct a chain complex and a boundary map $(C_*(X, H), \delta)$. The chain complex

$$C^*(X, H) = \otimes_i C_i(X, H). \tag{6.5}$$

where $C_i(X, H)$ is a $\mathbf{R}$-vector space consisting of $\sum_{\mu(\tilde{x})=i} \xi(\tilde{x})\tilde{x}$ where the coefficients $\xi(\tilde{x})$ satisfy the finiteness condition that

$$\{\tilde{x}; \xi(\tilde{x}) \neq 0, a_H(\tilde{x}) > c\}$$

is a finite set for any $c \in \mathbf{R}$. We recall that the Novikov ring Λ_ω is defined as the set of formal sum $\sum_{A\in\pi_2(X)} \lambda_A e^A$ such that for each $c > 0$, the number of nonzero λ_A with $\omega(A) \leq c$ is finite. For each $(x, u_x) \in \mathbf{R}(H)$, we define

$$e^A(x, u_x) = (x, u_x \# A),$$

where $\#$ is the connected sum operation in the interior of disc u_x. It is easy to check that

$$\mu(e^A(x, u_x)) = 2C_1(A) + \mu(x, u_x). \tag{6.6}$$

It induces an action of Novikov ring Λ_ω on $C_*(V, H)$.

Next we consider the boundary map, where we have to study the moduli space of trajectories. Let $J(x)$ be a compatible almost complex structure of ω. We can consider the perturbed gradient flow equation of a_H:

$$\mathcal{F}(u(s,t)) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \bigtriangledown H(t, u) = 0,$$

where we use s to denote the time variable and t to denote the circle variable. At this point, we ignore the homotopic class of disc, which we will discuss later. Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \{u : S^1 \times \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R} \,|\, \mathcal{F}(u) = 0, E(u) = \int_{S^1\times\mathbf{R}} (|\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}|^2 + |J(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \bigtriangledown H(t, u)|^2) dsdt < \infty\}.$$

Because $a(H)$ has only non-degenerate critical points, the following lemma is well-known.

Lemma 6.3. *For every $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, $u_s(t) = u(s, t)$ converges to $x_\pm(t) \in \bar{\mathbf{R}}(H)$ when $s \to \pm\infty$. If H is non-degenerate, u_s converges exponentially to its limit, i.e., $|u_s - u_{\pm\infty}| < Ce^{-\delta|s|}$ for $s \geq |T|$.*

By this lemma, we can divide $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ into

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \bigcup_{x^-, x^+ \in \bar{\mathbf{R}}} \mathcal{M}(x^-, x^+; H, J),$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, x^+; H, J) = \{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}; \lim_{s\to-\infty} u_s = x^-, \lim_{s\to\infty} u_s = x^+\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathbf{R}^1$ acts on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, x^+; H, J)$ as translations in time. Let

$$\mathcal{M}(x^-, x^+; H, J) = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, x^+; H, J)/\mathbf{R}^1. \tag{6.7}$$

$\mathcal{M}(x^-, x^+; H, J)$ consists of the different components of different dimensions. For each $(x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+) \in \mathbf{R}(H)$, let $\mathcal{M}((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+); H, J)$ be the components of $\mathcal{M}(x^-, x^+; H, J)$ satisfying that

$$(x^+, u^- \# u) \cong (x^+, u^+)$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{M}((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+); H, J)$. Then, the virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+); H, J)$ is $\mu(x^+, u^+) - \mu(x^-, u^-) - 1$.

Next, we need a stable compactification of $\mathcal{M}(x^-, x^+; H, J)$.

Definition 6.4: *A stable trajectory (or symplectic gradient flow line) u between x^-, x^+ consists of trajectories $u_0 \in \mathcal{M}(x^-, x_1; H, J), u_1 \in \mathcal{M}(x_1, x_2; H, J) \cdots, u_k \in \mathcal{M}(x_k, x^+)$ and finite many genus zero stable J-maps $f_, \cdots, f_m$ with one marked point such that the marked point is attached to the interior of some u_i. Furthermore, if u_i is a constant trajectory, there is at least one stable map attaching to it (compare with ghost bubble). We call two stable trajectories to be equivalent if they are different by an automorphism of the domain. For each stable map f, we define $E(f) = \omega(A)$ and denote the sum of the energy from each component by $E(u)$. If we drop the perturbed Cauchy Riemann equation from the definition of trajectory and Cauchy Riemann equation from the definition of genus zero stable maps, we simply call it a flow line.*

Suppose that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+); H, J)$ is the set of the equivalence classes of stable trajectories u between x^-, x^+ such that $E(u) = a(x^+) - a(x^-)$ and $(x^+, u^- \# u) \cong (x^+, u^+)$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{B}}((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$ be the space of corresponding flow lines. A slight modification of [PW] shows that

Theorem 6.5:([PW])$\overline{\mathcal{M}}((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+); H, J)$ *is compact.*

We will leave the proof to readers.

The configuration space is $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$-the space of flow lines converging exponentially to the periodic orbits $(x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+)$. Next, we construct a virtual neighborhood using the construction of section 3. Since the construction is similar, we shall outline the difference and leave to readers to fill out the detail. The unstable component is either a unstable bubble or a unstable trajectory $u \in \mathcal{B}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$ where $\mathcal{B}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$ is the space of C^∞-map from $S^1 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ converging expentially to the periodic orbits. When u is a unstable trajectory, u is a non-constant trajectory and has no intersection point in the interior. Theirfore, $\mathbf{R}$ acts freely on $Map_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$ We want to show that

$$\mathcal{B}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+)) = Map_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))/\mathbf{R} \tag{6.8}$$

is a Hausdorff Frechet manifold. Using the same method of Lemma 3.4, we can show that

$$\mathcal{B}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$$

is Hausdorff. For any $u \in \mathcal{B}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$, we can construct a slice

(6.9)

$$W_u = \{u^w; w \in \Omega^0(u^*TV), w_s \text{ converges expentially to zero and } ||w||_{L^p_1} < \epsilon, ||w||_{C^1(D_{\delta_0}(e))} < \epsilon, w \perp \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}(e)\},$$

where $\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}$ is injective at e. Let $u \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$ be a stable trajectory. Recall that for closed case, the gluing parameter for each nodal point is $\mathbf{C}$. For the trajectory, it satisfies the perturbed Cauchy Riemann equation. In particular, the Hamiltonian perturbation term depends on the circle parameter. Therefore, the rotation along circle is not a automorphism of the equation. The gluing parameter is only a real number in $\mathbf{R}^+$. If we have more than two components of broken trajectories. The gluing parameter is a small ball of

$$I_k = \{(v_1, \cdots, v_k); v_i \in \mathbf{R} \& v_i \geq 0\}, \tag{6.10}$$

where $k+1$ is the number of broken trajectories of u. We call u *a corner point*.

Remark: *A minor midification of Siebert's construction (Appendix) is needed in this case. For the trajectory component, H^0, H^1 should be understood as the space of sections which are exponentially decay at infinity. Recall that the vanishing theorem of H^1 was proved by certain Weitzenbock formula, which still holds in this case.*

The obstruction bundle $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\delta((x^-, u^-), (x^+, u^+))$ can be constructed similarly. Sometimes, we shall drop u^-, u^+ from the notation without any confusion.

For the corner point, a special care is need to construct stabilizing term s_{x^-, x^+}. The idea is to construct a stabilized term first in a neighborhood of bottom strata. Then, we process to the next strata until we reach to the top. Furthermore, we need to construct stabilization terms for all the moduli spaces of stable trajectories at the same time. We can do it by the induction on the energy. Since there is a minimal energy for all the stable trajectories, the set of the possible values of the energy of stable trajectories are discrete. We can first construct a stabilization term for the stable trajectories of the smallest energy and then proceed to next energy level. By the compactness theorem, there are only finite many topological type of stable trajectories below any energy level. To simplify the notation, let's assume that the maximal number of broken trajectories for the element of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-, x^+)$ is 3 and there are three energy levels. We leave to readers to fill out the detail for general case. Suppose that $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$, where u_i is a trajectory connecting x^{i-1} to x^i attached by some genus zero stable maps. Moreover, $x^0 = x^-, x^1, x^2, x^3 = x^+$. Since u_i is not a corner point, we can construct s_{u_i} in the same way as section 3. Here, we require the value of s_{u_i} to be compactly supported away form the gluing region. Note that over

$$\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-, x^1) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^1, x^2) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^2, x^+),$$

the obstruction bundle $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\delta(x^-, x^+)$ is naturally decomposed as

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\delta(x^-, x^1) \times \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\delta(x^1, x^2) \times \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\delta(x^2, x^+). \tag{6.11}$$

Then, $s_{u_1} \times s_{u_2} \times s_{u_3}$ is a section on

$$\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-, x^1) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^1, x^2) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^2, x^+)$$

supported in a neighborhood of u. Since its value is supported away from the gluing region, it extends naturally over a neighborhood of u in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-, x^+)$. We multiple it by a cut-off function as we did in the section 3. Then, we can treat $s_{u_1} \times s_{u_2} \times s_{u_3}$ as a section supported in a neighborhood of u in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-, x^+)$. By the assumption,

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, x^1) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^1, x^2) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^2, x^+)$$

is compact. We construct finite many such sections such that the linearlization of the extend equation

$$\mathcal{S}_e = \bar{\partial}_J + \bigtriangledown H + \sum s_{u_i}$$

is surjective over the bottom strata. Let

$$s_3 = \sum_i s_{u_i}$$

to indicate that it is supported in neighborhood of third strata. Next, let's consider the next strata

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, x^1) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^1, x^+) \cup \overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, x^2) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^2, x^+).$$

Two components are not disjoint from each other. Then have a common boundary in the bottom strata. By our construction, the restriction of s_3 over next strata is naturally decomposed as

$$s^3_{(x^-, x_1)} \times s^3_{(x_1, x^+)}, s^3_{(x^-, x_2)} \times s^3_{(x_2, x^+)}.$$

Then, we construct a section of the form

$$s^2_{(x^-, x_1)} \times s^2_{(x_1, x^+)}, s^2_{(x^-, x_2)} \times s^2_{(x_2, x^+)}$$

supported away from the bottom strata. Then, we extend it over a neighborhood of the second strata in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-,x^+)$. Over the top strata, we construct a section supported away from the lower strata. In general, the stabilization term s_{x^-,x^+} is the summation of s_i, where s_i is supported in a neighborhood of i-th strata and away from the lower strata. Suppose that the corresponding vector spaces are

$$\mathcal{E}^{m_{x^-,x^+}} = \prod_i \mathcal{E}_i. \tag{6.12}$$

We shall choose

$$\Theta_{x^-,x^+} = \prod_i \Theta_i, \tag{6.13}$$

where Θ_i is a Thom form supported in a neighborhood of zero section of E_i. with integral 1. We call such $(s_{x^-,x^+}, \Theta_{x^-,x^+})$ *compatible with the corner structure* and the set of $(s_{x^-,x^+}, \Theta_{x^-,x^+})$ for all x^-, x^+ *a system of stabilization terms compatible with the corner structure.* Suppose that $(s_{x^-,x^+}, \Theta_{x^-,x^+})$ is compatible with the corner structure. It has following nice property. (i) $s_{x^-,x^+} = s^t + s_l$, where s^t is supported away from lower strata and s_l is supported in a neighborhood of strata. (ii) the restriction of s_l to any boundary component preserves the product structure. Namely, we view

$$\partial\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-,x^+) = \bigcup_x \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-,x) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x,x^+). \tag{6.14}$$

The restriction of s_l is of the form

$$\bigcup_x s_{x^-,x} \times s_{x,x^+} \times \{0\}. \tag{6.15}$$

Let $(U_{x^-,x^+}, \mathcal{E}^{x^-,x^+}, S_{x^-,x^+})$ be the virtual neighborhood. Then, U_{x^-,x^+} is a finite dimensional V-manifold with the corner.

$$\partial U_{x^-,x^+} = \bigcup_x E^{ot}_{U_{x^-,x} \times U_{x,x^+}},$$

where $U_{x^-,x}, U_{x,x^+}$ are the virtual neighborhoods constructed by $s_{x^-,x}, s_{x,x^+}$ and E^{ot} is the product of other E_i factors.

When $\mu(x^+) = \mu(x^-)+1$, $dim U_{x^-,x^+} = deg \Theta_{x^-,x^+}$. We define

$$< (x^+,u^+), (x^-,u^-) >= \int_{U_{x^-,x^+}} S^*_{x^-,x^+}\Theta_{x^-,x^+},$$

where $(s_{x^-,x^+}, \Theta_{x^-,x^+})$ is compatible with the corner structure. When $\mu(x^+) < \mu(x^-)+1$, $dim U_{x^-,x^+} < deg \Theta_{x^-,x^+}$, we define

$$< (x^+, u^+), (x^-, u^-) >= \int_{U_{x^-,x^+}} S^*_{x^-,x^+} \Theta_{x^-,x^+} = 0, \tag{6.17}$$

For any $x \in C_k(X, H)$, we define a boundary operator as

$$\delta x = \sum_{y \in C_{k-1}} < x, y > y. \tag{6.18}$$

Novikov ring naturally acts on $C_*(V, H)$ by $e^A(x, u) = (x, u\#A)$ for $A \in \pi_2(X)$. Furthermore, it is commutative with the boundary operator. Next, we show that

Proposition 6.6: $\delta^2 = 0$.

Proof:

$$\delta^2 x = \sum_{z \in C_{k-2}} \sum_{y \in C_{k-1}} < xy >< y, z > z. \tag{6.19}$$

Let $< x, z >^2 = \sum_{y \in C_{k-1}} < xy >< y, z >$. It is enough to show that

$$< x, z >^2 = 0. \tag{6.20}$$

Consider $\mathcal{M}(x, z; H, J)$. Its stable compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(x, z; H, J)$ consists of broken trajectories of the form $(u_0, u_1; f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ for $u_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(x, y; H, J), u_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(y, z; H, J)$. Choose compatible $(s_{x,z}, \Theta_{x,z})$. The boundary components

$$\partial \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x, z) = \bigcup_y \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{x,y} \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{y,z}, \tag{6.21}$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{x,y}, \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{y,z}$ are the configuration spaces of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(x, y, H, J)$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(y, z; H, J)$, respectively. Furthermore, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{x,z}$ is naturally decomposed,i.e.,

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{x,z}|_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{x,y} \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{y,z}} = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{x,y} \times \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{y,z}. \tag{6.22}$$

Suppose that the resulting virtual neighborhood by $s_{x,z}$ is $(U_{x,z}, E^{x,z}, S_{x,z})$. Then,

$$\partial U_{x,z} = \bigcup_y E^{ot}_{U_{x,y} \times U_{y,z}}. \tag{6.23}$$

Note that $dim U_{x,z} = deg \Theta_{x,z} + 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \textstyle\int_{U_{x,z}} S^*_{x,z} d(\Theta_{x,z}) \\ &= \textstyle\int_{\partial U_{x,z}} S^*_{x,z}(\Theta_{x,z}) \\ &= \textstyle\sum_y \int_{U_{x,y} \times U_{y,z}} (S_{x,y} \times S_{y,z})^* (\Theta_{x,y} \times \Theta_{y,z}) \\ &= \textstyle\sum_y < x, y >< y, z > \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{y \in C_{k-1}} < x, y >< y, z >, \end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

where the last equality comes from (6.17). We finish the proof. □

Definition 6.7: *We define Floer homology* $HF_*(X, H)$ *as the homology of chain complex* $(C_*(X, H), \delta)$

Since the action of Novikov ring Λ_ω is commutative with the boundary operation δ, Novikov ring acts on $HF_*(X, H)$ and we can view $HF_*(X, H)$ as a Λ_ω-module.

Remark 6.8: *The boundary operator* δ *may depend on the choice of compatible* Θ_{x^-, x^+}. *However, Floer homology is independent of such a choice.*

Proposition 6.9: $HF_*(X, H)$ *is independent of* (H, J) *and the construction of the virtual neighborhood and the choice of compatible* Θ_{x^-, x^+}.

The proof is routine. We leave it to the readers.

Theorem 6.10: $HF_*(X, H) = H_*(X, \Lambda_\omega)$ *as a* Λ_ω*-module.*

Corollary 6.11: *Arnold conjecture holds for any symplectic manifold.*

The basic idea is to view $HF_*(X, H)$ and $H_*(X, \Lambda_\omega)$ as the special cases of the Bott-type Floer homology [RT3], where $H_*(X, \Lambda_\omega)$ is Floer homology of zero Hamiltonian function. The isomorphism between them is interpreted as the independence of Bott-type Floer homology from Hamiltonian functions. Instead of giving the general construction of Bott type Floer homology, we shall construct the isomorphism between $HF_*(X, H)$ and $H_*(X, \Lambda_\omega)$ directly. It consists of several lemmas.

Let $\Omega_i(X)$ be the space of the differential forms of degree i. Let $C_m(V, \Lambda_\omega) = \oplus_{i+j=m} \Omega^{2n-i}(X) \otimes \Lambda^j_\omega$, where we define $deg(e^A) = 2C_1(X)(A)$. For $\alpha \in \Omega^{2n-i}(X)$, define $\delta(\alpha) = d\alpha \in \Omega^{2n-(i-1)}$. The boundary operator is defined by

$$\delta(\alpha \otimes \lambda) = \delta(\alpha) \otimes \lambda \in C_{m-1}(V, \Lambda_\omega). \tag{6.25}$$

Clearly, its homology

$$H(C_*(V, \Lambda_\omega), \delta) = H_*(V, \Lambda_\omega). \tag{6.26}$$

Consider a family of Hamiltonian function H_s such that $H_s = 0$ for $s < -1$ and $H_s = H$ for $s < 1$. Furthermore, we choose a family of compatible almost complex structures $J(s, x)$ such that $J_s = J$ for $s < -1$ is H-admissible. Moreover, $J_s = J_0$ for $s > 1$. Consider the moduli space of the solutions of equation

$$\mathcal{F}((J_s), (H_s)) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J(t, s, u(t, s)) \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \bigtriangledown H$$

$S^1 \times (-\infty, +\infty)$ is conformal equivalent to $\mathbf{C} - 0$ by the map

$$e^z : S^1 \times (-\infty, +\infty) \to \mathbf{C}. \tag{6.27}$$

Hence, we can view u as map from $\mathbf{C} - \{0\}$ to V which is holomorphic near zero. By removable singularity theorem, u extends to a map over $\mathbf{C}$ with a marked point at zero. In another words, $\lim_{s \to -\infty} u_s = pt$. Furthermore, when the energy $E(u) < \infty$, $u(s)$ converges to a periodic orbit when $s \to \infty$ by Lemma 6.3. Let $\mathcal{M}(pt, x^+)$ be the space of u such that $\lim_{s \to \infty} u_s = x^+$. $\mathcal{M}(pt, x^+)$ has many components of different dimensions. We use $\mathcal{M}(pt, A; x^+, u^+)$ to denote the components satisfying $u \# u^+ = A$. Consider the stable compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(pt, A; x^+, u^+)$ in the same fashion. The virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}(pt, A; x^+, u^+)$ is $\mu(x^+, u^+) - 2C_1(V)(A)$. Choose the stabilization terms $(s_{pt,A,x^+}, \Theta_{pt,A,x^+})$ compatible with the corner structure. Its virtual neighborhood $(U(A; x^+, u^+), E(A; x^+, u^+), S(A; x^+, u^+))$ is a smooth V-manifold with corner. Notice

$$\partial(\overline{\mathcal{B}}(A; x^+, u^+)) = \bigcup_{(x,u)} \overline{\mathcal{B}}(pt, A; x, u) \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}((x, u); (x^+, u^+)). \tag{6.28}$$

By our construction,

$$\partial(U(A; x^+, u^+)) \cong \bigcup_{(x,u)} E^{ot}_{U(A;x,u) \times U((x,u);(x^+,u^+))}. \tag{6.29}$$

Moreover,

$$S(A, x^+, u^+)|_{\partial(U(A;x^+,u^+))} = \bigcup_{(x,u)} S(A; x, u) \times S((x, u); (x^+, u^+)), \tag{6.30}$$

Let $e_{-\infty}$ be the evaluation map at $-\infty$. We define a map

$$\psi : C_m(V, \Lambda_\omega) \to C_m(V, H)$$

by

$$\psi(\alpha, A; x^+, u^+) = \sum_{i=\mu(x^+,u^+)-2C_1(V)(A)} < \alpha, A; x^+, \mu^+ > (x^+, u^+), \tag{6.31}$$

where

$$< \alpha, A; x^+, \mu^+ > = \int_{U(A;x^+,u^+)} e^*_{-\infty}\alpha \wedge S(A; x^+, u^+)^* \Theta(A; x^+, u^+). \tag{6.32}$$

Lemma 6.12: *(i)* $\delta\psi = \psi\delta$.

(ii) ψ *is independent of the virtual neighborhood compatible with the corner structure.*

Proof of Lemma: The proof of (ii) is routine. We omit it.

To prove (i), for $\alpha \in \Omega^{2n-(i+1)}(X)$,

$$< \delta\alpha, A; x^+, \mu^+ >= \int_{\partial U(A;x^+,u^+)} e^*_{-\infty}\alpha \wedge S(A; x^+, u^+)^*\Theta(A; x^+, u^+) \tag{6.33}$$

$$= \sum_{(x,u)} \int_{U(A;x,u)} e^*_{-\infty}(\alpha) \wedge S(A; x, u)^*\Theta(A; x, u) \int_{U((x,u);(x^+,u^+))} S((x, u); (x^+, u^+))^*\Theta(x, u); (x^+, u^+)).$$

However,

$$\dim(U(A; x, u)) - deg(\Theta(A; x, u)) = \mu(x, u) - 2C_1(V)(A) < deg(\alpha)$$

unless $\mu(x, u) = \mu(x^+, u^+) + 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \int_{\partial U(A;x^+,u^+)} \beta \wedge S(A; x^+, u^+)^*\Theta(A; x^+, u^+) \\ = & \sum_{\mu(x,u)\mu(x^+,u^+)+1} \int_{U(A;x,u)} \alpha \wedge S(A; x, u)^*\Theta(A; x, u) \\ & \int_{U((x,u);(x^+,u^+))} S((x, u); (x^+, u^+))^*\Theta(x, u); (x^+, u^+)) \\ = & \psi\delta(x^+, u^+). \end{array} \tag{6.34}$$

□

Therefore, ψ induces a homomorphism on Floer homology.

Consider a family of Hamiltonian function H_s such that $H_s = 0$ for $s > 1$ and $H_s = H$ for $s < -1$. Furthermore, we choose a family of compatible almost complex structures $J(s, x)$ such that $J_s = J$ for $s < -1$. Moreover, $J_s = J_0$ for $s > 1$. Consider the moduli space of the solutions of equation

$$\mathcal{F}((J_s), (H_s)) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J(t, s, u(t, s))\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \bigtriangledown H$$

$S^1 \times (-\infty, +\infty)$ is conformal equivalent to $\mathbf{C} - 0$ by the map

$$e^{-z} : S^1 \times (-\infty, +\infty) \to \mathbf{C}. \tag{6.35}$$

Hence, we can view u as map from $\mathbf{C} - \{0\}$ to V which is holomorphic near zero. By removable singularity theorem, u extends to a map over $\mathbf{C}$ with a marked point at zero. In another words, $\lim_{s\to\infty} u_s = pt$. Furthermore, when the energy $E(u) < \infty$, $u(s)$ converges to a periodic orbit when $s \to -\infty$ by Lemma 6.3. Let $\mathcal{M}(pt, x^-)$ be the space of u such that $\lim_{s\to-\infty} u_s = x^-$. $\mathcal{M}(pt, x^-)$ has many components of different dimension. We use $\mathcal{M}(x^-, u^-; pt, A)$ to denote the components satisfying $u^-\#u = A$. The virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}(x^-, u^-)$ is $\mu(x^-, u^-) - 2C_1(V)(A)$. Consider the stable compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(x^-, u^-; pt, A)$ and its configuration space $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_\delta(x^-, u^-; pt, A)$. Choose the stabilization terms $(s_{x^-;pt}, \Theta_{x^-,pt})$ compatible with the corner structure. Furthermore, by adding more sections, we can assume that the evaluation map e_∞ is a submersion. Then, we define

$$\phi : C_m(V, H) \to C_m(V, \Lambda_\omega)$$

by

$$\phi(x^-, u^-) = \sum_A < x^-, u^-; A > e^A. \tag{6.36}$$

where

$$< x^-, u^-; A >= (e_\infty)_* S(x^-, u^-; A)^* \Theta(x^-, u^-; A) \in \Omega^{2n-i}(X) \tag{6.37}$$

for $i = \mu(x^-, u^-) - 2C_1(X)(A)$.

Lemma 6.13: *(i)$\phi\delta = \delta\phi$. (ii)ϕ is independent of the choice of the virtual neighborhood compatible with the corner structure.*

Proof: The proof of (i) is routine and we omit it. To prove (i),

(6.38)

$$\begin{aligned}
& d < x^-, u^-; A > \\
= \ & (e_\infty)_* dS(x^-, u^-; A)^* \Theta(x^-, u^-; A) = (e_\infty|_{\partial U(x^-,u^-;A)})_* S(x^-, u^-; A)^* \Theta(x^-, u^-; A) \\
= \ & \textstyle\sum_{\mu(x,u)=\mu(x^-,u^-)-1} (e_\infty)_* S(x, u; A)^* \Theta(x, u; A) \int_{U((x^-,u^-);(x,u))} S((x^-, u^-); (x, u))^* \Theta((x^-, u^-); (x, u)) \\
= \ & \phi\delta(x^-, u^-).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.14: *$\phi\psi = Id$ and $\psi\phi = Id$ as the homomorphisms on Floer homology.*

Proof: The proof is tedious and routine. We omit it.

7 Appendix

This appendix is due to B. Seibert [S1]. We use the notation of the section 2.

Lemma A1: *Any local V-bundle of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$ is dominated by a global V-bundle.*

Proof: The construction of global V-bundle imitates the similar construction in algebraic geometry. First of all, we can slightly deform ω such that $[\omega]$ is a rational class. By taking multiple, we can assume $[\omega]$ is an integral class. Therefore, it is Poincare dual to a complex line bundle L. We choose a unitary connection $\bigtriangledown$ on L. There is a line bundle associated with the domain of stable maps called dualized tangent sheaf λ. The restriction of λ_C on C is $\lambda_C(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$- the sheaf of meromorphic 1-form with simple pole at the intersection points $x_1, \ldots, x_k$. λ_C varied continuously the domain of f. For any $f \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_A(Y, g, k)$, f^*L is a line bundle over $dom(f)$ with a unitary connection. It is well-known in differential geometry that f^*L has a holomophic structure compatible with the unitary connection. Note that L doesn't have holomoprhic structure in general. Therefore, $f^*L \otimes \lambda_C$ is a holomorphic line bundle. Moreover, if D is not a ghost component, $\omega(D) > 0$ since it is represented by a J-map. Therefore, $C_1(f^*L)(D) > 0$. For ghost component, λ_C is positive. By taking the higher power of $f^*L \otimes \lambda_C$, we can assume that $f^*L \otimes \lambda_C$ is very ample. Hence, $H^1(f^*L \otimes \lambda_C) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{E}_f = H^0(f^*L \otimes \lambda_C)$ is of constant rank. It is easy to prove that $\mathcal{E} = \cup_f \mathcal{E}_f$ is bundle in terms of topology defined in Definition 3.10.

To show that $\mathcal{E}$ dominates any local V-bundle, we recall that the group ring of any finite group will dominate (or map surjectively to) any of its irreducible representation. So it is enough to construct a copy of group ring from $\mathcal{E}_f$. However, stb_f acts effectively on $dom(f)$. We can pick up a point $x \in dom(f)$ in the smooth part of $dom(f)$ such that stb_f acts on x effectively. Then, $stb_f(x)$ is of cardinality $|stb_f|$. By choose higher power of $f^*L \otimes \lambda_C$, we can assume that there is a section $v \in \mathcal{E}_f$ such that $v(x) = 1, v(g(v)) = 0$ for $g \in stb_f, g \neq id$. Then, $stb_f(v)$ generates a copy of the group ring of stb_f.

References

[AB] D. Austin and P. Bra am, Equivariant Floer (co)-homology and gluing Donaldson polynomials, preprint.

[B] K. Behrend, GW-invariants in algebraic geometry, preprint.

[DK] S. Donaldson and P. Kroheimer, The geometry of four-manifolds, Oxford Math. Monographs.

[E] Y. Eliashberg, Rigidity of symplectic and contact structures, preprint, 1981.

[F] A. Floer, Symplectic fixed point and holomorphic spheres, Comm. Math. Phys. vol 120 1989(575-611).

[FO] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant, preprint.

[GK] A. Givental and B. Kim, Quantum cohomology of flag manifolds and toda lattices, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. 41(1988), 775-813.

[Gr] M. Gromov, Pseudo holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds, Invent. math., 82 (1985), 307-347.

[HS] H. Hofer and D. Salamon, Floer homology and Novikov rings, preprint.

[K] J. Kollar, Rational curves on algebraic varieties, Springer Verlag.

[K1] J. Kollar, private communications.

[KM] M. Kontsevich and Y. Manin, GW classes, Quantum cohomology and enumerative geometry, Comm.Math.Phys., 164 (1994), 525-562.

[LT1] J. Li and G. Tian, Quantum cohomology of homogeneous manifolds, to appear in J. Alg. Geom..

[LT2] J. Li and G. Tian, Virtual moduli cycles and GW-invariants, preprint

[LT3] J. Li and G. Tian, Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of general symplectic manifolds, preprint.

[Liu] G. Liu, Associativity of Quantum cohomology, Stony Brook Ph.D Thesis,

[Lu] P. Lu, A rigorous definition of fiberwise quantum cohomology and equivariant Quantum cohomology, preprint

[M1] D. McDuff, Examples of symplectic structures, Invent. math., 89(1987), 13-36.

[M2] D. McDuff, Notes on ruled symplectic 4-manifolds, preprint.

[MS] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, J-holomorphic curves and quantum cohomology, University Lec. Series, vol. 6, AMS.

[O] K. Ono, On the Arnold conjecture for weakly monotone symplectic manifolds, Invent. Math, 1995, 119(519-537).

[PW] T. Parker and J. Woflson, A compactness theorem for Gromov's moduli space, J. Geom. Analysis, 3 (1993), 63-98.

[R1] Y. Ruan, Topological Sigma model and Donaldson type invariants in Gromov theory, Math. Duke. Jour. vol 83. no 2(1996), 461-500

[R2] Y. Ruan, Symplectic topology on algebraic 3-folds, J. Diff. Geom. 39(1994) 215-227.

[R3] Y. Ruan, Symplectic topology and extremal rays, Geo, Fun, Anal, Vol 3, no 4 (1993), 395-430.

[R4] Y. Ruan, Virtual neighborhood and monopole equation, to appear in IP Lecture Series.

[QR] Y. Ruan and Z. Qin, Quantum cohomology of projective bundles over $\mathbf{P}^n$, to appear in Trans of AMS.

[RW] Y. Ruan and S. Wang, in preparation.

[RT1] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, A mathematical theory of quantum cohomology, To appear in J. Diff. Geom., 1995; announcement, Math. Res. Let., vol 1, no 1 (1994), 269-278.

[RT2] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, Higher genus symplectic invariants and sigma model coupled with gravity, to appear in Invent.

[RT3] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, Bott-type symplectic Floer cohomology and its multiplication structures, Math Res Let, 1995, 2(203-219).

[Sa1] I. Satake, On a generalization of the notion of manifols, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, 1956 no 2 (359-363).

[Sa2] I. Satake, The Gauss-Bonnet theorem for V-manifolds, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 1957(464-492).

[S] B. Siebert, Gromov-Witten invariants for general symplectic manifolds, preprint.

[S1] B. Siebert, private communication.

[T2] C. Taubes, The Seiberg-Witten and the Gromov invariants, preprint, 1995.

[W1] E. Witten, Topological sigma models, Comm. Math. Phys., 118 (1988).

[W2] E. Witten, Two dimensional gravity and intersection theory on moduli space, Surveys in Diff. Geom., 1 (1991), 243-310.

[Ye] R. Ye, Gromov's compactness theorem for pseudo-holomorphic curves, Trans. Amer. math. Soc., 1994.